

INDEPENDENCY

Further proved to be a

SCHISM.

OR,

A Survey of D. Owen's Review
of his Tract of Schism;

With a Vindication of the Author
from his unjust clamours and
false Aspersions.

By D. Cawdry Preacher of the Word
at Billing Magn. in Northamp-
tonshire.



LONDON,

Printed for John Wright, at the King's
Head in the Old Bailey. 1658.

ANDERSON

THE PERSONS

OF THE

OF THE



AND

7

LONDON

To the Reader.

How unpleasing and distastfull the undertaking of the following Rejoynder was, and is, to me; not onely God, and mine own conscience, but also some speciall friends, can witnesse for me: And that the rather, because I cannot (if I would not wrong my Cause, and my self) but discover some personall weaknesses, or forgetfulnesse of my reverend Adversary, upon his denyals of some things, which (if there be any truth in reports) were known to be true. I could have heartily wished, that the reverend Doctor had taken more time, than the spare hours of four or five daies,

To the Reader.

“ when he was pressed with
“ more then ordinary occasions
“ of sundry sorts ; and deferred
the examination of mine till fur-
ther leasure, when his spirit was
more sedate and serious ; For I per-
ceive, he was in some passion,
(which quickned that haste) at my
Tract, comming out at that time, (a
little before the publick Act) and
that did cast a mist upon his judg-
ment and memory, which caused this
abortive birth. I conjectured by his
Epistle, what I might expect in his
Treatise, the heads whereof were
these: “ 1. My manifold mistakes.
“ 2. My presumptions, upon my
“ own principles. 3. My casting
“ reproaches on them, with
“ whom I had to do, &c. All
which are answered in my following
Discourse, and therefore spared
here. One thing he prepossesses his
Reader with ; “ That he expect
“ not any thing from this Tract,
“ but

To the Reader.

but what is necessary, for the
refutation of the Book, where-
unto it is opposed; which is least
of all performed. Complaints there
are good store, of personall wrongs,
many times repeated, from one end
of the Book to the other; but little or
nothing said to the vindication of
his Cause, against the Argumenta-
tive part of mine; as many others
have observed. He farther saies;
He forbears all charge on
the Presbyterian way; as to
the differences in judgment
and practise among them-
selves, which are more and
greater, then any this Author
hath found amongst them.
Truly it cannot be denied, but there
are too many differences amongst
us, in judgment and practise, (who
caused them, I forbear to say) but
with this difference; from them and
theirs, that ours are betwixt man
and man, one man and another;
theirs

To the Reader.

theirs are in one and the same man,
differing from, and contradicting
himselfe, in a short space of time, as
hath been made appear else-where.
Another thing he would have his
Reader expect, (the waiting for
which, hath caused this delay of
mine, at least in part) "A vindic-
"cation of Mr. J. C. from some
"unjust (so he calls them) impu-
"tations of mine. Truly there was
nothing imputed to him, but his in-
constancy in his opinions, and
self-contradictions, (as now to the
reverend Doctor) out of his own Wri-
tings. I heard of that Discourse
above three years since, in the hands
of one of the Brethren; and inten-
ded then, by him, to be published.
(as it is now promised, or rather
threatned, by the reverend Doctor
to cast a flurre upon me, (as it is
thought) which why it is thus long
silenced, I will not conjecture. One
I wish those, that intend to rake in
the

To the Reader.

be ashes of the Dead, to consider,
whether they shall deserve any
thanks for their labour. I have no
more to say to his Epistle, referring
the rest to the Tract it self. Farewell,
and love Truth as well as Peace.

the first of the Text is to be
understand they shall deliver
thanks for their labour.
more to say to his Epistle, re-
sponding to the Text itself. I have
and love Truth as well as Peace.

Errata.

Page 9. line 4. *a fine*, read propagate.
p. 8. l. 19. r. that. p. 12. l. 5. for them,
r. him. p. 13. l. last, r. invented. p. 38. l. 5. *a fine*,
r. Anabap. p. 41. l. 2. *a fine* for ease, r. ease.
p. 50. l. 11. *a fine* after *not*, put in *at*. p. 51.
l. 17. after *said*, put, *in*. p. 55. l. 2. after *brand*,
put in *our*. *Ibid*. l. 3. after *is*, put in (*no*.) p. 71.
l. 3. for singular, r. signific. *Ib*. l. 8. *a fine*, r. se-
cession. p. 72. *Marg*. 18. in Marg. that Note
should have stood higher, about the middle.
p. 73. l. 3. *a fine* after *to*, put in *be*. p. 166. l. 10.
r. exceptions. p. 109. l. 8. *a fine*, r. formally and
the same; l. 3. *a fine*. p. 111. l. 1. for his, read
this.

Independency further pro-
ved to be a Schism.

OR,

A Survey of Dr. Owen's Re-
view of his Tract of Schism.

CHAP. I.

IT is very true, which
the reverend Do-
ctor saies; "That
"considering the
"various interests
"of Parties at dif-
"ference, there is
"no great successe to be promised, by
"the management of controversies,
"though with never so much evidence
"and conviction of truth. The present
Selfaries of all sorts, give a sad instance
of this, not one of a thousand being
reclaimed from their errors, by the
clearest demonstrations of truth, but
rather "growing worse and worse, de-
"ceiving and being deceived, as the
B Apostle

Independency further proved,

Apostle did foretell us, There are there-
 fore ~~other~~ ^{and} propounded to them-
 selves, by those that undertake them,
 "As the rendering an homage to the
 "truth, the safeguarding of some weaker
 "professors, from the sophisms and
 "violence of adversaries, &c. Which its
 well, if they can & do attain. How little
 successe the reverend Doctor expected,
 he told us in his former Treatise of
Schism, and now again professes, (as
 well he might, upon such principles)
 "That he was so far from hoping, to
 "see speedily any visible fruits, of the
 "efficacy of the truth, he had managed,
 "that he promised himself a vigorous
 "opposition; onely, he was not able
 "to conjecture, from what hand the
 "first assault of it would arise: That is,
 Whether from *Papists*, *Episcopalists*, or
Presbyterians. The truth is, he hath gi-
 ven them all a provocation, to an oppo-
 sition, by his *new notion* of Schism, (be-
 side others) and I a little wonder, that
 none other have done it, unless it be up-
 on the old Maxim, *Contra negantem prin-
 cipium non est disputandum*. The notion of
Schism, in the nature of the word, & use of
 it, by all parties hitherto, being a breach
 Mar. 2. 21. of which, in what kind, or degree soever.

It was well observed by a learned man, *Χειρ*
that the reverend Doctor's notion of *Χίσμα*
Schism was this: "If my coat be rent, *γινεται*.
"and hang together by some threads; it *The rent is*
"is a Schism; but if a piece be quite torn *made worse*
"off, it is none. And indeed, if Schism
be only a difference, in a particular
Congregation, (as the reverend Doctor
will have it) and no separation from a
true Church, be justly accounted a
Schism, (as he professes to hold) the
generall agreement of all the forenamed
parties, in the common notion of
Schism; and their concernment in it, (all
of them supposing themselves, to be
truly constituted Churches) call for an
opposition to him, for denying himself
and party to be Schismaticall, in re-
nouncing of communion with them,
and separating from them all; for they
all concur, in the ancient and received
notion of Schism. *τοιαυτα*. "A breach
"of union, or a causelesse separation,
"from a truly stated Church. The dif-
ference between them is onely this,
which of them hath the true Church state;
which if it be determined, they all agree
in the conclusion: "A breach of union
"with, or a causelesse separation from
"such a Church so stated, is a Schism.

189. Thus the *Rationalists* argued, as himself
propounded their argument of Schism,

189. thus the *Episcopall* party;

thus the *Presbyterian*. But it seems, the

reverend Doctor, conjectured aright,

that the opposition was like to arise from

some of the *Presbyterian* party, though

he mistook the reasons; "The preju-

dices that they might (fear them-

selves, and interests, obnoxious to,

by a reception and establishment of

that his notion of Schism; Which

what they could be, I cannot conje-

cture. If his notion were true, it might

be as useful to them, as to himself, in

freeing them also from the charge of

Schism by others: But if it prove false,

(as it seems to me, and many) it will be

prejudicial to our common cause, a-

gainst the other parties, to whose charge

of Schism he did oppose it. Let him

draw up his argument against them;

thus I suppose it must be framed: "All

Schism (in the Scripture Ecclesiasti-

cal sense) is a division in a particu-

lar Church: But we have made no

division in (or separation from) any

particular Church; (one of you plea-

ding your selves to be the Catho-

lik, the other a National Church),

to be a Schismatic

Ergo, We are no Schismatics: They would quickly deny his *major* proposition (for which he offers no proof) Schism, in proper *sensu* of the word, and intention of the Scripture, is of larger and more generall extent: for any breach of union with a true Church of any degree. And if the proposition be not generall, the *Syllogism* is peccant in the very form, and so a *Sophism*.

But not content with that former reason, he (*steighing* enough) gives another: "Men contentedness, to make use of their quietness, in reference to Popery, Socinianism, Arminianism, confirmed such thoughts in me. Whereas it is evident, that the men of the *presbyterian* party (even country *Ministers*, who want *Academicall* opportunities) have done, and do as much contest against these and other errors, as himself, or any of his party. Few of the men of his way, having appeared in opposition to them, (though too much for toleration of them) but contented to make use of their quietness, to propogate their own *designe* of Independentism: not so much as caring to answer, or take notice, of what hath been written against

Page 4.

Independently further proved,
against it. His *surmises* (which he charges me with hereafter) are as strong, as his *conjectures*; That his *Treatise* should be refuted, he heard it was judged necessary at *sundry conventions*. And page 9. talks of my *advisers*; and once more, of the *promoters* of my work, page 181. whereof I know nothing. I can professe, that I expected and hearkned, that some more able hand would have undertaken it; and finding none willing, I ventured my own credit and thoughts, to the vindication of the truth of our *Churches* and *Ministry*, to some good progress, before any one man knew I had undertaken it. What acceptance his *Treatise* found, with many learned and godly persons, (except of his own way) I cannot conjecture. But this was the *resentment* of it, by all that I met with, before I ever saw his Book: That by his new notions of Schism, and constitution of a particular Church, he had not onely freed his party from the charge of Schism; but also unchurcht our Churches, and unministered our Ministers, and denied our Ordination. And every one wished, that some body would undertake it, as *injurious* to our Churches;

they, but none would interest himself
therein. I must confesse my own pre-
sumption, in what I have done, as ra-
king the work out of some learned
hands, whom it more concern'd to an-
swer it. The *originall* charge of Schism
upon our Church, (which the reverend
Doctor took upon him to answer) be-
ing directed onely to the two *Rever-
end*, whose cause the reverend Doctor
hath I think betrayed, by his new no-
tion of Schism, as if that were the
judgment and answer of them all. As
some others have found out, "A new
"way of justifying our separation from
"Rome, on principles of limiting the
"jurisdiction of that Bishop, to a pe-
"culiar Patriarchate, and the like; as
the reverend Doctor told us, of Schism.
page 192. Which *new waies* our cause
needs not, but is easily defended with-
out them; and "our plea will not be
"shaken to eternity, as the reverend
Doctor asserted, page 192. of Schism.
But he conjecturing right, (as he easily
might, being told it) of the party in ge-
nerall, and of the particular person, that
was like, and ready to undertake him;
he was as confident, "That he might
"relieve himself from his fears, and
"loa-

Independency further proved,

“loathing to be engaged in those contests, by these ensuing considerations which I shall briefly consider.

Page 5.

1. “He was fully perswaded, that what he had written, was, for the substance of it, the truth of God, which he had good security he had in weaknesse maintained, page 3. 1. No doubt, but he might fully so perswade himself; and what *Haretick*, learned or unlearned, does not so believe? But what was my *designe*, but to undeceive him in this perswasion, as to many things by him asserted? 2. What was that truth, he was so fully perswaded of? That *Schism*, in the places of the *Corinthians*, where the word is onely found; was a *difference* or division in a particular Church, who ever denyed it? or what is this to the *generall nature* of *Schism*? Is that all that *Schism* imports? Or, proves it, that breach of the union of Churches, or *causelesse separation* from true Churches, is no *Schism*? What force is there (I appeal to his *Logick* and *Divinity* too) in this consequence, “*Schism*, in the places cited, “was a division in a particular Church; “*Ergo*, Nothing is a *Schism* but that; “in Scripture notion. Yet this *notion*, the

the reverend Doctor oft makes use of, to avoid the charge of Schism, upon himself and party, as I have else-where shewed.

“He had (he saies) laid in provision, against all contending about words, expressions, &c. and every thing, though true, that might be separated from the life or substance, of the notion or truth pleaded for: viz. The sentence afore noted, concerning the notion of Schism. He had indeed laid in a politick petition of the question, that all Readers would be so favourable, as to grant him his new notion, or else he could expect no good issue of his Treatise; for so he professed, pag. 30. “Unlesse men will condescend so to state it upon the evidence rendered, I shall not hope to prevail much, in the processe of this discourse: And such I think hath been the successe. Can any rationally man be taken with this inference? “This evill mentioned by the Apostle, is Schism; therefore nothing else is so? Yes, (which to me is a wonder, in so wise a man) the reverend Doctor is convinced by it, and resolved so to continue; for so he said, “Having before asserted this to be the
“chief

Of Schism, ^{cc} chief and onely seat of the Doctrin
 pag. 42. ^{cc} of Schism, I am inclinable so to do
 and this I am resolved of, that unless
 any man can prove, that something
 else is termed Schism, by some divine
 Writer, &c. I will be at liberty, from
 admitting it so to be. Something
 was said to this in my former Treatise
 page 39. I add a little more; 1. His as-
 sertion, that this was the chief and onely
 place of the word Schism, in the Ec-
 clesticall sense, was granted him; but
 that it was the chief and onely place
 of the *Doctrine of Schism*, is now deny-
 ed him; because the Apostle did here
 indeed, reprove and check them for
 their *Schism* and divisions, but inten-
 ded not to speak to the *doctrine*, or full
nature of Schism; that must be else-
 where enquired and found out, either
 from the *notion* of the word *ἑσμός*, or
 other words of *equivocal* sense. 2. He
 requires, that something else be termed
 Schism, by some divine Writer; that is
 he expects, that he must have the same
 word, or else, though it have the same
 nature, and be equally *criminous*, he
 is resolved, nothing else is *Schism*, but
 a *division* in a particular Church; con-
 trary to his own grant. page 21. of
 Schism:

ism; That that alone shalbe esteemed Schism, which is in scripture so called; or (marke that) which hath the entire nature of that, which is there so called. But (say I) other words in other places, have the entire nature of Schism, viz division in a church, & something more & separati- from it; Ergo, that may be esteemed schisme, as I instanced in other words & places; to which the Reverend doctor sayes nothing.

g. "The whole weight of the little pile, turning on one single hinge and that visible and conspicuous, &c. he promised himselfe, that he who undertook it, would be farre from passing it by, and set himselfe to the superstructure, &c. This he repeats againe p. 76. "That he laid the great weight of the whole, upon this notion of Schism; that in that only place of the *Corinthians*, there is mention of Schism in an Ecclesiastical sense, &c. To which I say, 1. If this hinge of the whole, was so visible and conspicuous, I cannot but wonder; that I alone should not see that, which to every considering person that should but view the Treatise, would

Independency further proved,

“be evident. And that he should for-
 ten charge me” with ignorance of
 “designe; of which anon, 12, I was
 farre from passing it by; that I granted
 them this to be the onely place; but
 not the full importtance and nature
 the word; yea I endeavored to shew
 that there was a degree of *Separation*,
 that place, as to some *Ministers* and *Or-
 dinances*; which how he hath taken away
 we shall heare anon, 3. Granting his
 his sense in that place, I proved his con-
 sequence to be naught. “The Schism
 “amongst the Corinthians, was a divi-
 “sion in a particular Church; For
 “nothing else is schism, in the scripture
 “sense. Which consequence, all con-
 sidering and rationally men, that I speak
 with; do wonder to fall from so great
 a Logicalian and Divine. 4. This *Notion*
 his, I knew well, was the *Hinge* or *Ke-
 y* of the whole superstructure; by
 the *Circumference* or lines, by way
 of *consecutaries*, * extended to a great
 distance, as thus: If *Schism* be onely
 Difference in a particular Church, then
 his party are no *Schismaticks*; in sep-
 arating from, 1. The Church of Rome
 2. From our Nationall, 3. Or Presby-
 terian Churches. Now the *Antecedent*

* He says
 his first
 Chapter of
 the nature
 of Schism
 contained
 the founda-
 tion of ma-
 ny infe-
 rences
 Page, 52.

ing by me demolished, as the hinge
such consequences; the whole Super-
structure is fallen with its owne weight;
his whole Treatise with it; As wiser
men than my selfe do think.

He expressely waved mens Judg-
ment, and Authority, old or late;
and so promised himself, security from
such disturbance, &c. To which I
answered, The *Concurring iudgement* of all
men, in all ages, of all perswasions,
carries weight with it, especially when
it agrees with expresse Scripture; or re-
ason and ratiōall deduction: to which
he professed to stand or fall, Cap. I. 5. 3.
to which he sayes just nothing.

Wheteas he had confin'd him-
selfe to a bare defensative of some,
not intending to cast others from
their places, (unlesse the Roman par-
ty) he had some expectations that
peace-loving godly men, would not
be troubled, that an apparent immu-
nity from a crime, was, without their
prejudice, manifested in behalfe of
their brethren, &c. But he must know
that his defence of some from the crime
of Schisme, as it was too weak to bear
it off, by the bare *Notion* of Schisme by
him inuerr'd; so it did cast an aspersiō
upon

upon others of a false Accusation, charging them with Schism; and besides, in the consequences of that Notion, did cast others (beside the Roman party) from their places, as no Church no members of a Church, as shall appear ere long: but I appeal any of reason, godliness, and indifferent judgment to determine whether he himself did not blow the Coal that gave fire to this dissension, by his new notions of Schism, and of a particular Church, &c.

pag. 8.

6. But he adds this more to his thoughts, "That he obviated the fault of tending a discourse to a particular purpose; by its being led out of the common road, wherein common place-supplies would be of little use. Truly that was likely to cause some Opposition; that the Reverend Doctor went out of the Common road, (where was no allowed way) by his Singular notion of Schism; that never was gone in by any before him, nor I think will be followed by any after him, (I only except another Notionist, *Lord Mollin*, in another controversie in his *Corollarium*, p. 100. Who in approbation of this new notion, tells us; "The whole Christian world, from the Apostles

times;

times, never knew of such a notion of the nature of Schism, till the Reverend Doctor taught it them. And I readily believe him; onely I think he should have added, that the *Apostles* themselves never knew of such a notion. That ever was said by me "about minister's callings, Church-government, or the like, was occasioned by him-
self, in his *superstructures* upon that weak foundation, as shall appeare.

Whether the Reverend Doctor, hath given a plain and full returne to what pag. 9.

may seeme of importance in my Book, others must judge, and not we our selves; who do observe (all I meet with) that little or nothing is said by him, to the *Argumentative part* thereof, but some *slight relations*, to defend his own *new Notions*; leaving the principal parts untouched. This will appear in his *Account* of his thoughts, in the new of my Treatise; which he twice recapitulates for failing, to give notice of the particulars of it. I must take a review of them.

He sayes, "I am without any provocation intended or given, reviled from one end of it to the other; and called partly in downe right termes,

termes, partly by oblique intimations
 of Sathan, Atheists, Scepticks, Donatists,
 Hereticks, &c. I must professe, when
 I first readd this charge, I stood amazed
 and astonished, that my Treatise should
 be charged with the crime of *reviling*
 whereupon I took it up, and read
 over again and again, to see, if I could
 discover so much *weaknesse* or *guil-*
nesse in my self; and fearing my own
partiality, I consulted with other lear-
 ned and godly persons, who had read
 it, who professed, they found nothing
 in it, but words of truth and sobernesse
 and such as might become a Christian
Adversary, as being *sharp* to the cause
 he opposed, but sufficiently *respectful*
 to his person, whom he did oppose.
 But this is not the least misery in Con-
 troversies, that what is intended against
 the way, is applyed to the person, and
 so provokes by accident to further
 strife. But for those particulars, by him
 called *revilings*, I give him this account.
 If at any time call him personally
 schismatick, which I think I do not,
 but onely his way and party to be schis-
 matick, he knowes I cannot avoid it,
 if I make good the Title of my Book,
 supposing him to be an Independent.

he is generally taken to be. And why may not a good man be a schismatick, as well as those honest Corinthians, whom both the Apostle and himself, charge with the crime of schism? If I have not proved his way to be a schism, I shall confesse my wrong, in calling of it, or him, Schismaticall. 2. For the word *Sectary*, that followes upon the former; if men by schism separate into *fractions* or *sections*, they will deserve the name of *Sectaries*; and himself calls some men so. 3. For *Heretic*, as it was more than I charged him or his way with, (speaking strictly of *Independents*) so I never call them so; though I believe himself does not deny, but some Independent Churches are *Hereticall*. 4. For *Donatists*, I only charged their principles upon his way, which if they be acknowledged to be schismaticall, (as they are, by all that are Orthodox, and by himself confessed to be criminall at least) the parallel will fall upon them, whether I will or no; as it doth upon the *Romanists*, embracing and maintaining the same principles. 5. For the word *Pharisee*, when he spake, as I thought, too contemptibly of Christians, the multitude, the wicked, and

Independency further proved,

and profane, I onely said, "*This sound*
"too much of the Pharisee. But it
 known, they separate from the best of
 our Congregations, as well as from
 such. My answer here, was just the same
 that the learned Doctor Hall gave to the

Apol. s. 28. Brownists, for like aspersions upon our
 Congregations. 6. As for those words
Atheist or Sceptick, the first is but once
 used, page 15. in these words: "*He*
"that denyes, that professed Christians
"may be compelled to the externall pro-
"fession of the onely way of worship, seems
"to me to be, if not an Atheist, a Sceptick
"in Religion. What's this to the reve-
 rend Doctor, or any man living, that
 does not deny that my assertion? The
 word *Sceptick* is once more used, upon
 the like supposition, page 187. 7. Last-
 ly, the worst is, that I call him *Sathan*;
 which I no where do, in downright
 terms, nor necessarily, in an oblique in-
 timation or reflection: For 1. A man
 that saies to a blasphemer, or other no-
 torious slanderer or curser, *The Lord*
rebuke thee, (which were the words he
 excepts against, & yet these not directly
 spoken neither) does not presently call
 him Devill or Sathan. 2. The cause of
 using those words, was very urgent and
 provo-

provoking, as I thought, in his charging our Ordination to come from Antichrist the Root; which was in effect to deny or annull our Ministry and Churches: As our blessed Saviour did obliquely, yea directly, call a man as good as himself, Sathan, when he would have hindered him from suffering: "Get thee behind me, Sathan, for thou savourest not the things that be of God, &c. 3. And what is that lesse, (if not more direct) then calling me Sathan, page 22? when speaking of me, as carried beyond all bounds of moderation, and Christian tenderneffe in offending; he adds, "I no way doubt, but that Sathan hath his designe in this whole businesse. Jam sumus ergo pates. If this be reviling, from one end of the book to another, let the indifferent Reader judge. Yea, some do say, (and I could observe it) that the reverend Doctor, though he have given me very sweet words and complementall; yet hath secretly more reviled me, and endeavoured to blast my reputation, with godly men, than I have him. I may note it in some passages hereafter.

In this one p. 11. discovering sanguinary thoughts against them pag. 11.

2. The next is no lesse bitter; "The professed designe of the whole, is to prove Independency, to be a great schism, and

Independency further proved,

" that Independents are schismaticall se-
 " ctaries, the troublers of England. That
 " it were happy for the Nation; they were
 " out of it. Or discovering sanguinary
 " thoughts, in reference to them. And
 " these kind of discourses fill up the book
 " almost from one end to the other. I have
 much ado to forbear to say once more.
 The Lord rebuke thee, in the sense afore-
 said. 1. For the first part, that my de-
 signe was, to prove *Independency* to be
 a great schism, and consequently Inde-
 pendants (whom I mean, we shall hear
 anon) to be schismaticall, I cannot de-
 ny, if I intended to make good the title
 of my Book; and such kind of discourse
 must necessarily fill up my Book, from
 one end to another. But I pray, am I
 the first, that hath charged them and
 their way to be schismaticall? have not
 many learned and pious men done it
 before me? and is this the first time that
 I have so charged it, that it seems so
 novell to the reverend Doctor? And if
 they have, some of them, been proved
 such, and sectaries besides, do not such
 trouble the peace of the Church? Or
 some, I doubt not, he will confesse it
 and, with me, wish them any where
 rather then in *England*, and think the
 Nation

Nation happy in their avoidance. Paul said of such, "I would they were cut off that trouble you. 2. But for the latter part, "My discovering sanguinary Men whose thoughts, in reference to them. I should hate my self, if I were guilty of it, and shall appeal all Readers, when they hear my words, whether they import so much; page 200. "These new builders will gather a Church out of no Churches, and begin a new one: It had been happy for Old England, if they had all gone into New England, and laid the foundation of their Churches amongst the Indians, and not to build upon other mens foundations; and then tell us, They are building spick and span new Churches. This was the worst I said, and but once onely; as far from sanguinary, as from filling up my Book, from one end to the other.

3. But he goes on; "No Christian care seems to have been taken, nor good conscience exercised, from the beginning to the ending, as to imputation of any thing unto me, or upon me, that may serve to help the designe in hand. The designe he told us, was, to prove Independency to be a great schism; and, I must confesse, my care was, to make

that way to appeare as *Deformed* as I could, with *reason* and *truth*; but as for his person, being to me as very a stranger as I to him; I was so farre from wronging him, by false or strained imputations, that I gave him his *due commendations*, where I could; as appeares by my p. 36. and p. 102. both in *approving*, and *applauding* his discourse; and from one end of my book, to another, giving him his *due titles* and respect. But let him instance, in those conscience-lesse imputations upon him. "Hence (he sayes) "I think it is repeated an hundred times, "that I deny their Ministers, Churches, "and all Reformed, but our owne; which "is notoriously untrue, contrary to my "knowne judgment, to expresse affirmati- "ons in my book, &c. But 1. the Reverend Doctor speaks *Hyperbolically* enough, when he sayes it is repeated, an 100 times, that he denyes our Ministers, &c. He may do well to number them, and see how farre short the reckoning comes, 2. I confesse, I took it for granted; that the Reverend Doctor was a *thorough Independent*, in the voice of all men; and I knew that *Independents* do deny our Ministers and Churches, &c. If the judgment of the reverend Doctor be

be now altered, I shall rejoyce much, in the *success* of any Treatie, mine or others, to his conversion, 3. But if he yet be constant to his *Principles* delivered in his former *Treatise*, and *vox populi* be not a *very lyar*; I shall not doubt if need be, to say a thousand times, he does at least by consequence deny our *Ministry*, and *Churches*; our *Ordination* and all, even our *Church-membership*. But of that more fully anone.

I cannot here but observe one piece of *policy*, the Reverend Doctor hath made use of (observed also by others) beyond his *Predecessours*, in this controversy, to *ingratiate* himselfe, and way, with vulgar readers, to make them seem the better. 1. That he is so free and frequent in *Commending* of me, his *adversary*. p. 10 and 46. 121. and else where; as *Hierome* said of *Ruffinus*, "He wrongs me with praises; Surely (they will think) he will never wrong the truth, that does right to his *Adversary*, 2. His extraordinary *Complements*, after the *Mode* of the times; may pretend to great *Humility*, considering the distance betwixt him and me, a Reverend Doctor and Deane, and a poore country *Presbyter*; such as these, "Let him at any time
"give

Independency further proved,

"give me a command to wait upon him, p. 39.

"19. I desire to know, when and where any

"I may personally wait upon him, p. 39. En

"humbly begg of this Author, that he re

"would favour me with a command, &c. are

"p. 35. See also. p. 92. 129. 139. 180. ne b

All most as oft repeated, as those charges oy

upon me afore; all which some would du

interpret for so many yeares, but I did l

not so, 3. He hath yet another policy, hof

taking it *pro confesso*, that I am guilty, lled

and that he would have his Reader thin E

so too; that is, his frequent prayers, Tre

for givenesse of my miscarriages, and his sen

owne forgivenesse; which is repeated in tha

my observation, 5. Times, p. 14. 51. me

124. 149. 180. As if he would by such my

Charity, perswade me also, as well as the

his reader, that I had greatly wronged

him. And yet it seems that though his

charity can forgive his wrongs, yet it

cannot forget them; for it is repeated

often, (30 times at least) that I wrong

him notoriously; and frequent charges of

me, with *untruth*, *wrongs*, *lies*, &c. to

make me odious to his Reader: yea there

is more bitterness couched in one sen-

tence, after he had newly prayed for

me, than is to be found in all my books;

pag. 14. this it is "Untill I saw this Treatise, I did

"not

him, not believe that there had remained in
 when any one godly, sober, judicious person in
 39. England, such thoughts of heart; in
 but reference to our present differences, as
 d, &c. are visible and legible therein and tells
 i 80 he boldly, "I have taken paines to cast
 argue "oyle on those flames, which it is every ones
 would duty to labour to extinguish. Whereas I
 t I did but cast water, as I thought, upon
 policy those flames which he had unhappily kin-
 ily dled, by his new Notions.

think But we have a second Review of my
 for Treatise, wherein my *Mistakes* are pre-
 his sented to the Reader, with respect to
 d in that influence they have into the argu-
 g i. mentative part of my discourse; viz.
 uch my ungrounded suppositions, as he calls
 as them.

I. "It is (says he) strenuously supposed ^{pag. 16.}
 "all along, that I deny all Churches in
 "England to be true churches of Christ
 "except onely the Churches gathered in
 "the congregationall way, That I may
 "distinctly answer this; let it be con-
 sidered, that (as I said before) I suppo-
 sed the Reverend Doctor, to be an In-
 dependent, upon the generall vote of
 all men, and I knew it to be the judg-
 ment of many; and the consequent
 of their declared principle, that no
 Churches their ex-
 * That this
 is the con-
 sequence of

plene Covenant, see what is the judgment of the Walachrian Churches : Hæc sententia privat omnes Ecclesias reformatas, quæ tali fœdere non uniuntur, vero Ecclesiastico ministerio, potestate Vocandi & Ordinandi ministros, legitima sacramentorum administratione, Ecclesiastica jurisdictione, &c. Et negat omnes in Ecclesiis illis baptizatos, ritè & verè baptizatos esse, &c. *Apollon. Confid. quarundam Controv. &c. pag. 23.*

Churches are truly constituted, but such as are gathered in the Congregational way. I took the word *Independent* generally, as comprehending *Brownists*, *anabaptists*, and other *Seſtaries*, who strenuously assert

that we are no *true Churches*. 3. Though I sometimes speak, as of the reverend Doctor his person, (especially, when his notion is new and singular, as in that of *schism*, &c.) yet I intended indefinitely, any kind of Independence, and not him distinguished from the rest. They commonly deny our Churches. In a word, I respected his *way*, rather than his *person*; all along my Treatise. What then? does the reverend Doctor, in his judgment, without *equivocation*, hold our Churches to be true Churches? We are glad of his *concessions*, but fear, that he will be *lost* with many *Independent Churches*, who hold us *Antichristian*; and believe, that his own *principles* will confute his present *concessions*.

...ions. But hear what he saies, "I now
inform him, that all those surmises are
false and untrue, pag. 17. And tells us,
He shall as willingly engage in the de-
fence of the Ministry, of the godly Mi-
nisters in England, with the lawfulness
of their Churches, as any what ever.
pag. 20. Though the words be ambi-
guously spoken, I must take heed of
opposition or suspicion of insincerity, in
his profession, lest he charge me with
new surmises: What then doth he scru-
dle at? "I onely in my Treatise have
questioned, the institution of a Nationall
Church. A Nationall Church hath (as
it was told) a double notion; it im-
ports either an Hierarchicall Church,
with subordination of Officers, (which
he saies, I do not maintain) or a Church,
where all the Churches of a Nation
agree in Doctrine and Worship, and
celebrate it accordingly, in the Presby-
terian way. Which of these does he
question? or rather, which of them does
he allow to be true Churches? Does he
not renounce and dispute against both,
as Churches not truly constituted, and
so, in the judgment of Independents,
Brownists, Anabaptists, no true Churches,
yea, Antichristian? Do not his
own

Independency further proved,

own principles infer this conclusion
 "If any man hath nothing to shew, but
 "successive Ordination, through, or from
 "Rome, he looks not on him, as a Minister
 "of Christ. But all our Ministers
 have nothing else to shew, (as valid)
 make them Ministers, but their suc-
 cessive Ordination; Ergo, He looks upon
 them as no Ministers of Christ, and
 consequently, we have no Churches.
 Will he engage in defence of such
 Ministry, such Churches? But more
 this again, ere long. And now I am
 indebted to give him any satisfaction
 (having done him no injury) he had
 posed himself to the censure and displea-
 sure of many godly Ministers, Churches
 and Christians, before ever I saw this
 Book. And I go on to the next.

2. A second supposition (he says) is
 "That whatever the presbyterian Min-
 "sters and Churches be, he hath separa-
 "ted from them, as have done all those
 "whom he calls Independents. What says
 the Reverend Doctor to this; "Dost
 "this reverend Author know, that this
 "denied by us? Is it not sufficiently dis-
 "proved, in that very Treatise which he un-
 "dertakes to answer? However, the re-
 verend Doctor himself, might not

ed, *usually separate from us, holding compli-*
ment in preaching or hearing, in our
or from churches, to what ends, he knowes.
Admire surely, those Independents whom
names, Brownists, Anabaptists, &c.
utterly refuse communion with us,
Anichristian, as no Churches, no M-
upsters: Yea, many of those who are
, single, or singular Independents, not yet
one so far as Brownists or Anabaptists,
do not so much as hear (much lesse re-
ceive the Sacrament) in our Churches,
nor lesse some of theirs preach. And may
they not justifie it upon his own prin-
ciples? Does he not confidently deny,
any separation from a Church to be
schism? And in this place, does he not
loosely justifie their separation; "The
blameable separation must respect some
union of Christs institution. Now where-
in have we (we, not I) separated from
them, as to the breach of any such union?
I pray now, what's this, in true sense,
but, we have indeed separated from you,
but without breach of any union of
Christs institution, for you were not
Churches united, according to his in-
stitution. Just as he pleaded for separa-
tion from Rome, and from the Nationall
Church. And what followes hence, but
this,

this, We are no true Churches; and their separation is just. Thus he pleads for all, Independents, Brownists, Anabaptists; for the plea is theirs, to justify the separation. Some of them can come and hear in our Churches, but up

+ Robinsons latter principles, not as Churches, or Ministers, but as gifted brethren. But hear him plead for himself: “

“my part, what hath he to lay to my charge

“I condemn not their Churches in general

“to be no Churches. Nor do the Brownists so, some true Churches they do

show us, of the Independent dresse;

least, comparatively, they say, we are not

so bad as the Whore of Babylon. But

goes on: “I never disturbed, that I know

“of, the peace of any one of them, nor

“separated from them. What? was he

never of any particular Church, as

member, as a Minister? not of that in

Essex? did he never separate from them

nor disturb the peace of that, or some

Churches, by raising divisions in them

soliciting proselytes out of them? Had

he not by his book of Schism, cast fire

into all the Churches of England? Did

+ he not labour to gather a Church, in his

own Colledge, if report fail not? In his

former book, and present defence, doth

See Dr.
Hall Apol
p. 52. Med.

not advise others, to come out of our churches? Of schism, page 270. If all is be true, his crime preceded his punishment, and he may be content to bear whilst I go on to the next.

3. "He supposeth throughout, that I deny, not onely the necessity of a successive Ordination; but, the lawfulness of it also. No, I supposed (and proved) that he denies the lawfulness of our successive Ordination; by which I understood, not onely imposition of hands, but the whole authoritative translation of man, into the state of an Officer of the church. Now, does not the reverend doctor deny our Ordination as fully, as Romishs or Anabaptists, upon the same ground, because we had it successively from Rome? I repeat his words again; If any man have nothing to plead for his Of schism. Ministry, but meerly that successive P. 196. Ordination, received through the Church of Rome, I cannot see a stable bottom, of owning him so to be. If this be not to deny our Ordination and Ministry too, let the Reader judge. If he thinks sufficient to say, he doth not deny our Ordination, because he is pleased to satisfy us with another plea, page 197. of schism; that he disclaims all thoughts
"of

"of rejecting those Ministers, as Papal
 "and Antichristian, who yet adhere
 "that Ordination, being many of the
 "eminently gifted of God, &c. and sub-
 "mitted to by the people, &c. This is
 far from justifying our Ordination,
 our being Ministers by vertue thereof
 that it doth the clean contrary: It tells
 us onely, That though indeed our Or-
 dination do not make us Ministers, yet
 we are not by our Ordination so in-
 capacitated, but that, notwithstanding
 we may by somewhat else be made Mi-
 nisters; viz. our gifts, and the people's
 submission. And if (when he saies,
 does not renounce his own Ordination
 his meaning be this, that he doth not
 deny, but that he was ordained, and yet
 holds, that notwithstanding his Ordina-
 tion, he may (upon some other ac-
 count) be a Minister, we wish he would
 have spoken out, and let others judge
 whether this be a renouncing of his
 Ordination or not.

pag. 24.

But the reverend Doctor seems to
 turn'd Orthodox, in point of Ordina-
 tion; "I say, it is according to the mind
 "of Christ, that he who is to be ordained
 "unto office in any Church, receive imposi-
 "tion of hands from the Elders of the
 "Church.

Church, if there be any there; and this to be done in a way of succession, that the Churches may be perpetuated. Mark, imposition of hands from the Elders of that Church, not by a Presbytery foreign to that Church; If there be any there. But if none there, he tells us not, what is to be done then. Besides, he speaks onely of imposition of hands, which he blamed others for) as if that were all of Ordination, when as he told us, "The Scripture compriseth in it, the whole authoritative translation of a man into an Officer, differing from the other as whole and part. And that succession he speaks of, ceases, when there are no Officers in that Church, or a new Church to be erected; then it must fall upon the people, or I know not whom. But now comes this change, and how long? Was it not the reverend Doctor, that when some young men came to advise with him, about their Ordination, dissuaded them from it? Was it not he that said, that he would maintain against all the Ministers of England, there was in Scripture no such thing as Ordination? Was it not he, that when it was objected to him, desiring to be a Parliament-Man, that he was incapable of it,

Independency further proved,

as being a Minister, would not answer, He was, or was not a Minister? this was vox populi, at Oxford. And was not this to renounce his Ordination? What then is it that he doth oppose? “*The denying* (suppose it should be the deriving) “*this successive Ordination, through the authority of Antichrist.* This fallacy does not become the reverend Doctor’s learning, it is *fallacia compositionis*. We derive our Ordination, not from Antichrist, but from such as were truly presbyters, successively ordained, though with some corruptions: This he was told again and again, was the answer of all our best Divines, but he takes no notice of it: Yea, Luther, and our first Reformers, had no other Ordination but such; will he look on them as no Ministers of Christ? Hear what he saies:

pag. 24. “*Before the blessed Reformation begun, and carried on by Zuinglius, Luther, &c. there were, and had been, two states of men in the world, professing the name of Christ and the Gospell, as to the outward profession thereof; the one in glory, &c. the other poor, &c.* Consider now, whether the reverend Doctor do not acknowledge the Church of Rome to be a Church, professing the name of Christ

Christ and the Gospel, as to the outward
 profession of it? which lately he did deny,
 and will again ere long, page 26. And
 I ask, of what Church Luther and Zwin-
 glius were, before the Reformation?
 of either of Rome or none; a corrupt
 Church, but yet a Church. But he adds;
 "As to the claim of a successive Ordina-
 tion, down from the Apostles, I made
 bold to affirm, I could not understand
 the validity of it, as successive, which
 was derived to us, from, and by, the first
 party of men in the world. I hope, if any
 Church can prove a successive Ordina-
 tion from the Apostles, it would be no
 prejudice, but an honour to it; as the
 Greek Church, I suppose, does plead,
 and not from Rome. And if it was our
 unhappinesse, to have our successive Or-
 dination through fouler hands, (if at least
 fouler then some of the Greek Chur-
 ches) yet truly Ministers, shall that in-
 validate our Ordination? Must we be
 charged, to derive our Ordination from
 Antichrist, as Antichrist, or from the
 Beast, as the Beast, because we had
 it from some that were members, or of-
 ficers of that (newly confessed) Church?
 That was it that warmed my * zeal so
 much, as to tell the reverend Doctor, pag. 25.

pag. 25.

* So he ex-
 cused Au-
 stin against
 the Dona-
 tists, p. 166

that he cast dirt in the face of our Ministry, and to be ready to say, *The Lord rebuke thee.* Dare he appeal the Searcher of all hearts, he had no designe in all this, to cast dirt on any godly Minister in England, when as this is the filth that is daily cast upon us, by his friends, the *Brownists, Anabaptists*, and some *Independents*, not yet gone so far as others,

Bartlet, in
his Model.

Our *Antichristian Ministry*? He call'd for satisfaction, for supposed wrongs; but what satisfaction will he give, to all the Ministers of England, and other Nations, for thus reviling of them, to say, "*They derived their successive Ordination, through the authority of Antichrist.*" But (saies the reverend Doctor)

pag. 26.

"*Might not another answer have been returned, without that wrath? This is so, or it is not so, in reference to this Nation: If it be not so, and they plead not their successive Ordination from Rome, there is an end of this difference.*" This is a pleasing notion to the reverend Doctor, for he uses it twice more, once page 28. and again, page 130. But 1. Might not the reverend Doctor have given a better

D. Hal A-
pol. against
Brownists,
sect. 30. p.
508.

resolution of the case, as all our Divines hitherto have done? Our successive Ordination is not claimed from Rome as

Papal

Papall or Antichristian, but from *Rome*,
 so far as *Christian*, the *Papacy* being but
 the *Leprosie* of that Church. Must he
 needs take the *worser part* of the distin-
 ction, and cast dirt on our Ministry, be-
 fore *Papists*, and all our *Sectarian* ene-
 mies? And was not that my answer, to
 which he saith nothing, but still goes
 on to provoke by *scornfull* language.
 His *Dilemma*, with its horns, intends to
 gore us on both sides; "If it be not so,
 there's an end of this difference, we are
 wholly agreed; and what need those ex-
 clamations? pag. 28. That is, if we
 do not plead our *Ordination* from *Rome*,
 (and have no other to plead) we have
 none at all, and so no *Ministers*, no *Chur-*
ches, that way. If it be so, that we say,
 we have our *Ordination* from *Rome*, then
 he concludes us *Antichristian*, You have
 your *Ordination* through the *authority* of
Antichrist. To prevent both these, I di-
 stinguished as afore: We have it not
 from *Rome* as *Antichristian*, but from
Officers of that Church, though much
 corrupt. Are we now at all agreed, when
 he derives our *pedigree* from *Antichrist*
 and the *Beast*, and I derive it from *Offi-*
cers of that Church, which he rejects?
 Calls he this an Agreement? I say it is
 from

from Rome, and he sayes so too, and so the vulgar must believe, we are agreed. *Dolosus versatur in universalibus* and hates Distinctions as evill doers do the light.

But I asked, why may not this be a sufficient foundation of our Ministry as well as for our Baptism? He asked me (as afore) "If it be so, and be so acknowledged, whence is that provocation that arose from my Enquiry after it which may receive the same answer as afore: The provocation arose from charging us to receive both, from the Authority of Antichrist. And I asked him Whence he derived his owne Baptism? To which he gives no satisfactory answer, but now tells me (very strangely) "I judge their Baptism good and valid, but to deal plainly with him, not on that foundation. Upon what then? Might not the men that received their Baptism and power to Baptize from that successive ordination, receive also power to ordaine? or does he so far joyn with the Anabaptists, that any disciple, no-Minister, may baptize; or does he renounce his successive baptisms, as some (if not himselfe) have done their Ordination from Rome? Heare his answer; "I cannot be-
lieve,

believe, that that Idolater, murdherer, man
 of sinne, had, since the dayes of his open
 Idolatry persecuti^{on} and enmity to
 Christ, any authority more or lesse com-
 mitted to him from the Lord, nor over his
 Churches. Change the Scene, and let
 him tell us; what he believes concern-
 ing Christian Idolatrous persecuting Ma-
 gistrates; Do they thereupon forfeit their
 Authority over their people and
 Churches? *Parcius ista*: If he say, its o-
 therwise with Ministers, I put him the
 case of the Idolatrous persecuting high
 Priests among the Jewes; Were they pre-
 sently Exauthorized upon those miscar-
 riages? nay, must not Antichrist sit in the
 Temple of God, 2 Thes. 2. 4. that is,
 the Church; "professing the name of
 Christ, and the Gospell, as to the outward
 profession thereof; as he told us, p. 24.
 The Reverend Doctor hath endeavour-
 ed to elude that text, (of Schism p. 154.),
 by a glosse or interpretation of St.
 Austins de. civ Dei. l. 10. c. 59. That
 the words are thus to be rendered; "A
 setting up against the Temple of God,
 not a sitting in the Temple of God; and *Estius*, in
 could be content it should so be taken *loco*.
 for a present shift, which is by Papists
 themselves rejected, as most improbable,

Independency further proved,

who grant it meant of the Church ; that
Ant. christ must sit in the Church, and
 by most, if not all our Divines, so un-
 derstood in the controversie of *Ani-*
Christ, "*He must not be looked for, with-*
out the Church, but within the bosome
of the Church; Beza in locum. Yea if the
 Reverend Doctor had consulted the
 text ; he had found *Austins* glosse the
 more improbable if not impossible ; for
 the words are thus in the Greek, ὡς
 αὐτὸν εἰς τὸν ναὸν τῆς θεᾶς ὡς θεὸν καθεῖσθαι,
 would this be a genuine sense ; "*So that*
he as God, sets up himselfe against the
Temple of God ? Besides that this
 would be a kind of Tautology, having
 before called him ὁ ἀντικείμενος, ἢ ὑπερ-
 εχόμενος ἐπὶ πάντας λεγόμενον θεόν &c. And
 did he not tell us, that such Churches
 as ours, may for ought he knowes, be in
Italy. p. 49 ? Lastly, Said he not also,
 "*Grant the usually received sense, it im-*
 "*ports no more, but that the man of sinne,*
 "*shall set up his power against God, in the*
 "*midst of them, who by their outward*
 "*visible profession, have right to be called*
 "*his Temple, that is, the Church: for are*
 not they that make an outward visible
 profession of Christ and the Gospel ;
 rightly called a Church though corrupt
 and

and wicked. Did not Satan dwell and
 and his throne in a Church, *Rev. 2. 13.*
 un- of *Pergamus* ? But enough of that.
 but I said, he and his party would not
 have been pleased with *Ordination* from
Presb. yrie, though not from *Rome*:
 he asks me angrily ; “ *I pray, who told*
you so ? when, wherein, and by what
meanes have I opposed it ? I acknowledge
my selfe of no party. I have told him
 fore, when and wherein and by what
 meanes he hath opposed it ; if he please
 to look back. I onely add, he opposed it,
 by assigning *Imposition* of hands onely to
 the *Elders* of a particular Church ; and
 by offering to gather an *Independent*
 Church, as I have been credibly inform-
 ed. What need his charge of “ *Transpor-*
 “ *tation and reflections upon him, and*
 “ *that without due observation of truth* pag. 27.
 “ *and love.* But, its worse, that he charges
 me with an untruth, “ *As if I acknow-*
 “ *ledged those first Reformers had their*
 “ *ordination from the people ; when as I*
 speak the direct contrary. The first *Re-*
 formers, *Luther &c.* had not their ordi-
 nation from the people, but from *Rome*,
 p. 116. et alibi. I onely excepted
 some *Extraordinary* ease, where no
Ministers were to be had for *Ordination*,
 and

and that onely for the first turne.

pag. 29.

But he is as much displeased for me affirming, that he hath renounced his owne Ordination. He askes "Who told him these things? I am now necessitated to tell him, that all these things are false, and utterly in part and in whole untrue, and he is not able to prove one of them.

My reasons, or rather Evidences of this charge of renouncing his ordination were these, 1. The world looks at him, as an Independent of the highest note; and knew it is their judgment, that our ordination is Antichristian; and if so, its time for him to renounce it. 2. I know, from good hand, that some of the Brethren have renounced their ordination; so I am told, "They all renounced their ordination in England, and ordained one another in Holland; when Mr. Ward was chosen pastor, and Mr. Bridges Teacher at Rotterdam, first Mr. Bridges ordained Mr. Ward, and then immediately Mr. Ward againe ordained Mr. Bridges. Thus one hand washes another, and I might reasonably think; the Reverend Doctor had also renounced his. 3. I had divers times heard, that he declaimed against and dissuaded our ordination; and I thought it not probable

Anat. of
Independ.
pag. 23.

ne. would still retain it. 4. I concluded
 or m. his owne principles in his book of
 ced his schism, that our successive ordination
 bo tel me from Antichrist and the Beast as
 suare ore; and that those "That insist upon
 false pleas, would (if he mistake not) keep
 true up in this particular what God would have
 then pulled downe, p. 198. of Schism. And
 if this would he keep it up in himselfe? If I
 were so perswaded; I should renounce
 as any Ordination to night, before to mor-
 and now. 5. If this be not sufficient, let him re-
 member what he said in the presence of
 or most of his owne Canons, at a pub-
 lic meeting, speaking of his Ordination
 by the Bishop of Oxford, in that place;
 and that he valued it no more, then that crum-
 upon his trencher or neere it, which he
 fillipped away. It may be, his Canons will
 not affirm this to me (though to some
 others they have,) but I shall put it up-
 on this Issue; that if they will give it un-
 der their hands, that they never heard
 him say those or such like words, I shall
 believe the report was false. 6. I would
 appeal his owne conscience, Does he
 believe his former Ordination valid? Does
 he do any Ministeriall at now, by vertue
 of his former ordination? if not, what's that
 but a renouncing of his ordination? If he do,
 he

pag. 29.

he contradicts or condemnes himself, reserving an Ordination; which he counts *Amichristian*. And then, who meanes those outcries, “*I was not yet so dealt withall, by any man what party soever: Does this dealing come a Minister of the gospels &c.*” Whether those *Recharges* upon me, 30. be not utterly *untrue*, and undoing his *Reverence* and *piety*, I leave to all indifferent Readers to judge, what hath been the *Language* and *carriage* of my former discourse; and what hath here been returned. This Chapter being a *Recapitulation* of my whole book from one end to another, hath held me very long. I shall promise to be shorter in those that follow.

CHAP. II.

In answer to my Appendix.

THIS Chapter is a meere *Review* of the first, if not in that the first is last yet in that the last is first. The Reverend Doctor indeed promised us, “*a speedy account of the Closure of my book*” p. 11. and in the *Closure* of his former Chapter,

Chapter: but I must confesse, I did not expect it; nor will I conjecture at a preproperous vindication of his reputation, as he calls it. Had not his former book of *Schism* recanted, if I may say, contradicted his former judgment, I had not medled with it; I can sincerely professe, my intention was not to blast his reputation, or to cause a person to suffer (to whom I was and am a very stranger, not having, above once, so much as seen his face) but to prevent the prevalency of his way, by the Authority of his person; to the drawing off of some well meaning people, *Rom. 16. 8.* who are easily deceived by fair words, and personall respects; this I thought might the better be done, by presenting to them the errors and *Inconstancy* of the men, that endeavour their seducement. The *Apostle Jude* describes Seducers, by such a Character; they are wandering Stars, as in places, so in judgment *Inconsistent* with themselves, and their owne opinions. But if he marked, I did first in my precedent Chapters; endeavour (with little success, I confesse) to shew those persons, the errors of that way, before I discovered the *inconstancy* of the person; and *Inconsistency* of

of his former and present thoughts: And therefore we may have reason to suspect *their judgment*, who are so changed in their opinions; having instances enough of men, that have run from self to another, till they have lost themselves, and all *Religion*. But to return to the business in hand, the reverend Doctor, after the proposition of other waies of excusing himself, for his inconsistency, at length confesses the fact, with the ground and means of that alteration of his judgment.

1. The ground was this, the *unsuitableness* of his former principles to the *dependent* way; for so he saies: "Upon a review of what I had then asserted, (his former Treatise) I found, that his principles were far more suited, to what is the judgment and practise of the Congregationall men, than those of the Presbyterians. This was the ground of the change, that I conjectured at, when I said, 'Perhaps these principles of his, if laid, might mislead others and himself' &c. pag. 237. Those principles were that gifts and submission of the people were sufficient in some cases, to make a Preacher of the Gospel; not having distinguished between a Preacher in a large

and in a stricter sense, that is, between an *Instructor* (common to men and women,) and a preacher in Office peculiar to some. For neglect of which distinction, how easie was it for men supposing the case to be now extraordinary, and an *intercision* of all ordinances) finding themselves (as they easily believe) sufficiently gifted, and a giddy people, thirsting after novelties, willing to be taught by such teachers, to take upon them the Office of Preachers? This is so visibly the *Doctrine and Practice* of all the Sects, that he that runs may read it. But the Reverend Doctor had there laid down other *Presbyterian* principles, which are irreconcilable with his new congregational way; as shall appear.

2. The *meanes* of his conversion was this: Undertaking to read the Books written on both sides (the congregational and the Presbyterian way) he fixed on one "to take under peculiar examination; which seemed most methodical, and strongly to maintain that which was contrary to his present persuasion: that was Mr. Cottons Book of the Keyes; intending the confutation of it. But contrary to his many Interests, he

Independency further proved,

" he was prevailed on, to receive that
 " those principles, which he thought to
 " himself in an opposition unto. And thus
 commonly it fares with those that un-
 dertake controversies, being before pre-
 judiced with the principles of that way
 as the Reverend Doctor professes he was.
 " But had he observed his own rule
 examining impartially all things by
 " Word, comparing causes with causes
 " &c. laying aside all prejudicate respects
 " unto persons or present traditions, and
 considered the books written against
 that very Treatise, and no more; he
 might perhaps have been confirmed in
 his Presbyterian way, as many learned
 and pious men have been. Wherefore
 now there is little hope of recovering
 him back to his first Principles, for he
 tells me " That being by that means se-
 " led in the Truth, he is ready to maintain
 " it to me and others, and finds cause to
 " rejoyce in it, in the day of the Lord Jesus.
 I shall only request him, that he would
 impartially consider, what hath been
 written against the Treatise of his Con-
 version, before he enter into new
 contests with me or others, or publish
 that tract of the Authors, which he
 threatn'd me with, in his Epistle: which if

do, there is some hope he may re-
turn to his former *Presbyterian* princi-
ples, as others have done, without any
great prejudice to his reputation; he
professing himself to be of neither, of
any party, p. 27.

Before I consider his answer to my
appendix, I shall desire leave to pre-
mise, that my scope was not "to help on
with the proof, that *Independency* is a
great Schism, as he pretends p. 32. Nor
to cause his person to suffer, as I said
before; nor yet to confute that treatise
itself, (though by the by, I might disco-
ver some weaknesses in it): but "to prove
from it, his inconstancy and inconsisten-
cy with himselfe, who yet undertakes
to convert others to, or settle them in, the
Independent way: And I most of all
wonder, that he should so confidently
deny his change from what he then de-
clared, and say "I am punctually of the
same judgement still, when as he clearly
professes his change in one particular,
p. 44. and that a *materiall* one; And for
the rest, there needs nothing to con-
vince him of a great change, but onely
the Scheme of his differences in judgment
now, from what he asserted then; which
I shall exhibite to him, at the end of
this Chapter.

E

But

page. 40.

Independency further proved,

But before I do that, I shall onely
 way of short *strictures*, animadvert on
 few things. 1. That his judgment was
 altered, I proved thus: 1. He had, as
 thought, upon the reasons afore given
 renounced his ordination; at which
 "professes himselfe astonished to thinke
 "with what frame of Spirit, what neglect
 "of all truth and love, this businesse
 "managed. And I must re-professe, that
 I am astonished to think with what
 face or spirit of truth, he dare deny
 if all be true that is reported. I con-
 fesse, as he carries it, I cannot tell, whe-
 ther ever he was ordained or no, by
 or Presbytery, (for he discovers it not)
 and then indeed, he cannot renounce what
 he never had; as he sometimes argued in
 his former treatise of Schism: If he was
 not all ordained, and yet do Minister
 acts, his *tract*, I now consider, will con-
 demne him: If he was, I think he has
 done and said enough to argue his re-
 nuntiation of it. 2. My second proofe
 is by him contrived, that I think he was
 in a maze, when he writ it down; "be-
 "cause he thinks now, not only in a com-
 "pleat Church-state, but when no suc-
 "thing can be charged, that gifts & consen-
 "of the people, is enough to make a man

Preacher in office; both untrue and false
in fact. Untrue indeed and false, in
words and fact: for my words were
these; "He requires now no more but page. 222.
gifts and consent, and that not only in a
collapsed and corrupted Church, &c.
but now, when neither negligence nor
ignorance, can, without injury, be charged
upon our Church-state; The difference
visible to every seeing eye, without
any exaggeration. And the thing is true
word and fact; as shall appeare. To
my third observation, he sayes nothing;
Whether such a man, as he speaks of, so
qualified; be a compleat Minister, to
preach the Gospel authoritatively by way
of Office, and to administer Sacraments?
This we know, is true in fact, of many
this way: some things more there are
that Section, very considerably wor- Scil. 3.
ny of an answer; but he is not pleased
to take notice of them.

In the next place, he comes to his
opinion "of the personall in-dwelling
of the Holy Ghost in believers, and will
neither admit of my explication of his
former words, nor acknowledge any
difference of his judgment now and
then. I have not yet had leisure to
consider what he hath published upon
this

Independency further proved,

this head (not having his book), but cannot yet be convinced, to be of his judgment, nor many others more judicious : I thought I had assigned some *clear differences* in the words compared together ; but he will not accept my paines. I shall now tell him of one or two ; 1. His judgment now is, that the *Divine nature*, or the Spirit of God dwells personally in believers, and that the Spirit is the *Soul* that animates Christ and believers : but then, I said the union of Christ and believers must be *personall* ; for so is the union of Soul and body in man, So is the Union of the Divine and humane nature in Christ.

2. He said his former tract, that the same Spirit is in Christ and us ; but with this difference ; "*In him indeed dwelleth the fulnesse of it ; when it is bestowed on us only by measure* : but in his latter, or Schisme, he saies the Spirit dwells personally in believers ; but then (say I) we have the *fulnesse* of the Spirit, as well as Christ ; his *person* and *fulnesse* being inseparable. I might add, that the *fulnesse of the Spirit*, when ascribed to Christ as man, was not the *person* of the Spirit (for then the person of the Spirit also was interested in the *Mediatorship*) but

the fulness of the graces of the Spirit, which we have only in a measure, 1 Cor. 12. 8. "To one is given the word of Wisdom; to another knowledge; to another faith, by the same Spirit. But if the gift of wisdom be personally be given to every believer, all these should be given to one man, even as to Christ. But I forbear at this time any more.

As for his calling *Ministers*, by the name of *Parochiall Priests*, it is not worth contending: he puts it off, near, "By what the Prelates esteemed and call'd parish. *Ministers* which might pass very easily for an excuse, were it not, that many of the same reverend persons, were then *Parochiall Ministers* that are now; and ill deserved the name of *Priests*. 2. That the same pious men and *Ministers*, are till this day mocked and scorned by his *Independent* way, by the name of *Priests*, and worse. I might add, that the Reverend Doctor speaks ambiguously, when he saies, "I never called the Presbyterian *Ministers* of particular congregations *Parochiall Priests*. He may, or some may interpret it, that he meanes, there were no Presbyterian *Ministers* in Parishes, under the Prelates; and then indeed he did not call

call them Priests ; but enough
that.

page. 42.
&c.

For the remaining section of my Appen-
dix, though there are many things, that
deserved a better account from the
Reverend Doctor ; as charging him
with clear alterations of his judgements
and some contradictions to himself ; he
passes them over, “ some as injuries

page. 44.

“ some as full of reflections, *formers*, and
“ prognostications, And besides, pro-
fesses himself, since my exceptions, “
“ be of the same mind, that he was, with
“ the least alterations. Only in one thing
(and the worst of all) he confesses
change ; “ As to the liberty to be allowed

“ them, which meet in private, who cannot
“ in conscience joyne in the celebration
“ of publick Ordinances, as they are per-
“ formed amongst us, I confesse my self
“ to be otherwise minded at present, than
“ the words there quoted (Sect. 16.)

express. That is to say, I do now allow
conventicles of all sorts of Sects
who cannot in conscience joyne in pub-
lick in the celebration of ordinances
as they are performed among us : For
why should not all have the same li-
berty of conscience (which all pretend
Anabaptists, Quakers, and all, as he

plead

leads for himself and party? And is
 not this obliquely to *brand* publicke
 worship, as faulty? But this is more
 than he pleaded for, in his book of
Schisme: that every man must follow
 his own *lights*, and so gather into new
Churches, to the rending of the Church
 into a thousand pieces. Did ever any
true stated Church suffer such disorder?
 Will he allow this in his own Church?
 Do they not bind all their *members* to
 continue with them, and not to forsake
 them? Sees he not sufficiently the *mis-*
chiefs of such liberty of private *conven-*
ticles? are they not the *Seminaries* of
faction, Schism, Errors, Blasphemies, and
 abominable profanenesse. Let him
 answer his own *cautions* and *objections*,
 with his judgment formerly upon
 them; with his own *Latine* discourse,
 against such liberty pleaded for, by the
Remonstrants. Does he not see men pride
 themselves of their gifts, and create
 themselves Pastors in separate congre-
 gations? Tells us he not, that such do-
 ings, "will help to overthrow the very page. 33.
 "constitution of any Church, by confusion;
 "or the flourishing of it, by Ignorance;
 "both which certainly follow such cour-
 "ses? Sayes he not well; "This may

Independency further proved,

"be a means for men to vent their
 "private fancies to other ; to foment
 "cherish errors in one another ; to give
 "false interpretations of the Word, there
 "being no way to prevent it ? How will
 he answer these things ? Do we not see
 the event of that his prophesie dayly be-
 fore our eyes ? And does he now come
 to countenance these things, and to con-
 tradict himself, and yet tell us, that he
 is of the same mind still that he was
 and no whit changed ? May we not say
 to him, as his servants to Pharaoh, Exod
 10. 7. with change of a word, "Knowest
 "thou not yet, that England, (the Church
 "of England) is destroyed ; or as the
 Disciples to their Master, "Carest thou
 "not, that we perish ? But I forbear
 and because the Reverend Doctor stands
 so resolutely upon his assertion, that he is
 not changed, but of the same mind he
 was fourteen years agoe ; I shall now
 present to him and the Reader, a Scheme
 of his differences from himself, then and
 now ; as followeth.

of Pastors &
ent people distinguished

Of Schism.

Review.

1. He spake of
ore, as a col-
pled, corrupted
Church in Italy, pag. 156.
pag. 40.

2. Gifts in the
erson, and con-
ent of peo-
le, is warrant
ough to make
man a Prea-
ther, in an ex-
traordinary case
only: pag. 15. and
pag. 40.

3. He made
the Union of
Christ and belie-
ven, to be mysti-
call, pag. 21. We
are so parts of
him, of his mysti-
call body, that he
& we are become
thereby, as it
were, one Christ.
In him dwells the
fulnesse of the
Spirit, it is given
to us in measure.

1. He saies,
Rome we account
no Church at all,
pag. 156.

2 Denying our
Ordination as
sufficient, he
saies, He may
have that, which
indeed consti-
tutes him a Mi-
nister; viz. gifts,
and submission by
the people, pag.
198. in our case.

3. He makes
the union to be
Personall, pag. 94,
95. It is in the
person of the Spi-
rit, whereof we
are made parta-
kers. Ibid.

The form of
the Church Ca-
tholick is the Spi-
rit, whereby it is
animated, as the
body of man by
the soul, pag. 95.

1. I do not be-
lieve, that I-
dolater, &c. had
any authority
in, or over, the
Churches. pag. 26.

2. I am punctu-
ally of the same
mind still, pag. 40.
He may yet had said in his
first Book, pag. 46.
As to formall
teaching is requi-
red, 1. Gifts; 2.
Authority from
the Church; if he
do not here equi-
vocate.

3. Am I chan-
ged in this? No,
pag. 40. If the
Spirit personally
dwell in us, we
have him in ful-
nesse as well as
Christ, and not in
measure.

The union of
soul and body is
personal; the u-
nion of man and
wife is mysticall,
not personall:
4. In

Duty of Pastors &
People distinguished

Schism.

Review.

and 28.

Such is ours with
Christ.

4. In extraordinary cases, every one that undertakes to preach the Gospel, must have an immediate Call from God. pag. 28.

4. Yet required no more of before, but gifts, and consent of people, which are ordinary and immediate Calls. pag. 15. Neither is there any need or use of an immediate call, pag. 33. Of Pastor and People.

4. And to assure a man, is extraordinarily called to it, he gives three waies. 1. Immediate Revelation. 2. Concurrence of Scripture - rules. Some outward acts of providence. The two last whereof are immediate calls, pag. 30. Past. & People.

5. The Church government, from which I desire not to wander, is the Presbyterian. pag. 41.

5. He now is engaged in the Independent way

5. As settled in the truth, which he is ready to maintain, pag. 36. and knows it will be found his rejoicing in the day of the Lord Jesus. pag. 37.

6. Men ought not to cut themselves from the communion of the Church, to rent the body of Christ, and break

6. He sales, Separation is no schism, nor schism of any breach of charity, pag. 48, 49.

6. There is not one word in either of those cautions, that I do not still own and allow, pag. 44. Sure not without

Duty of Pastors &
People distinguish'd

Review.

the sacred bonds
of charity. pag. 48.

equivocation.

7. I conceive,
they ought not at
all, to be allow-
ed the benefit of
private meetings;
who wilfully ab-
stain from the
publick Congre-
gations, &c. pag.

7. As to the li-
berty to be al-
lowed to them,
which meet in
private, &c. I con-
fesse my self to be
otherwise min-
ded. pag. 44.

CHAP. III.

A review of his and my Preface.

THE reverend Doctor begins this Chapter with a complaint, (as his Book is full of such, either causelesse or needlesse, complaints) of "my repetition of his words, of such as I could wrest, by cutting off one and another parcell, &c. to serve me, to make biting reflections upon them, with whom I have to deal. To which I shall return but this: 1. The testimony of an adversary is strong against himself; To turn the point of his own

Independency further proved,

own sword into his own bowells, is an allowed way of *clearest victory*; and more than this, I have not done. That which a man *condemns* in another, may justly be applied to his *self-condemnation*, if he be *guilty* of the same crime. If not *guilty*, it concerned him to *disprove* it, and clear himself, and not to talk of *biting reflections*.

3. If he could do the like from my words, As I doubt not, but he would *“dresse me up in the like ornaments; so let him do it with like reason, if he can, and spare me not.*

He first falls upon the *Donatists* principles, improved not onely by *Romanists*, but by others, whom, I said, I yet named not; but (saies he) *its evident whom he means*; though hereafter he tels us, he knowes not *whom I mean*. What thinks he of their *two principles*, by me expressed, are they *schismaticall* or no? To give me satisfaction, (though with little hope of successe) he professes ingenuously, 1. *“If they were considered in reference to the Donatists, who owned them; I say, they were wicked, corrupt, erroneous principles, tending to the disturbance of the communion of Saints, and everting all the rules of love, &c.*

But then I would say, 1. What is the disturbance of the communion of Saints, and overturning all the rules of love, but Schism, by his own definition of it? and yet it was not in a particular Church, but from the Catholick. 2. If others profess the same principles, are they not as wicked, corrupt, erroneous, and schismaticall principles in them, as in the Donatists? Thus they are improved by Romanists, Brownists, Anabaptists, and some more strictly called Independents. 3. And then I desire to be satisfied, why he (to free his own party) laboured to excuse them from schism, though he seem to make them otherwise criminous; let him consider, if he did not endeavour it. The objection was, that Austin, and others, charged the Donatists with schism, for departing from the Catholick Church: What saies the reverend Doctor to it? this; "I shall freely declare my thoughts, concerning the Donatists, which will be of schism, comprehensive also of those other, that
 Page 164.
 suffer with them in former and after ages, under the same imputation: That is, unjustly called schismaticks, for the like separation. And in delivery of his thoughts of them, charges them with
 other

pag. 168.

other errors, but not with schism; for
 their separation. "To relinquish the
 catholic visible Church, is not schism, but
 a sin of another nature. Upon what
 ground, does he exempt them from
 schism, (as well as Protestants and him-
 self, by Romanists so charged) upon his
 new notion of schism? "I take schism
 in this argument, in the notion and sense
 of the Scripture precisely, page 190.
 That is, for division of judgment in
 particular Church. But the Donatists
 division and separation, was in and from
 the catholic Church; Ergo, no schism.
 And yet behold his unhappinesse, either
 in his forgetfulnesse, or in his inconsisten-
 cy, to his own principles! He seems to
 me to acknowledge their schism, and
 them schismaticall, in their separation,
 when he asks me angrily, "Do I plead
 for them? do I labour to exempt them
 from schism? Let the Reader judge.
 2. "If he intend my judgment of them,
 (those principles of the Donatists) in
 reference to the Churches of England,
 which he calls Independent, I am sorry
 he should think, he hath any reason to
 make this enquiry. I know not that man
 in the world, who is lesse concerned in
 obtaining countenance to those principles,
 than

Review,

pag. 120.

when I am. A fine evasion to save himself; let his Churches shift for themselves. I did not ask his own particular judgment, in reference to himself, (for I did not yet charge him to hold those principles) but in reference to many Independent Churches in England, which hold those principles, and practise accordingly. And he answers for himself, that he "is not concerned, in obtaining countenance to those principles: obscure enough. But its known too well, that many Independent Churches do affirm themselves, to be the only Churches in England, and none to be true members of a Church, but such as are joined in membership by a Covenant; which are the same in substance with those of the Donatists, and equally now branded, I think, to be schismaticall.

But what thinks he of our Churches? For my part, I acknowledge the Churches in England, Scotland, and France, &c. to be true Churches: Such, for ought I know, may be in Italy or Spain. I must profess, that if this was sincerely spoken, I should rejoice much in these concessions, in this vindication of himself; but the words are so ambiguous, that I know not well, by which handle

to take them. I ask, Do all Independent Churches in England think so of themselves? I believe they will under-write, *Magister hic non tenetur*; and rather renounce him, then assert so much of our Churches. Do they not many, yea most of them, account us *Antichristian*, as we said above? Do not his own principles contradict his present concessions? And would ask, If we be true Churches, will do they and he separate from us? The most of them for certain, do separate from us, as no Churches, no Ministers doth not he so too? No; "I have undeniably proved in my book of Schism, "have separated from none of them. This was spoken to above; and I shal take him for no Independent, if he do not separate from our Churches. But I pray, did he not plead for others, his party as well as himself; "We have separated from none of them? from no true Churches in England; why? because they are not truly constituted Churches; or, they were never members of them, and so could not separate from * them that

* See pag. 252. l. 35. It is impossible a man should offend against that which is not, unless they will say, We have separated from what should be.

were not: See page 257. Or, not reformed according to the mind of Christ. This evasion he learned

as spoken above, in this present
chapter. But this will come again
long, there something shall be said
to it.

When I said, that a learned Doctor
said, "His whole Book, or the greatest
part of it, was one great schism: He
answers, "I hope that is but one Doctors
opinion, because being nonsense, it is
not fit it should be entertained by many.
That that one Doctor said, many
more do think; nor is it any nonsense,
but usuall Rhetorick, to Scripture, and
other Authors, so to speak, to call a
schismaticall book, a schism, as to
call profligate sinners, by the name of
schism, and the like. The rest of this
chapter, and the most substantial things
wherein, wherein I required satisfac-
tion, he overlooks; as those of enforcing
uniformity on the one hand, and tolera-
tion of Religions on the other, which
he pretended to be one of them, the
way to peace; and some other pra-
ctises of Politicians, with the succeſſe
whereof, he thinks not good to take
notice of, or to discover which of the
states he likes best. And after some

renuall of his former complaints, suppositions, and many notable laches &c. he concludes this Chapter thus "So his first Chapter is discussed and forgiven. By which begging of the question, he would perswade both himself, his Reader, and me also, that I am very guilty, and himself very charitable, to forgive me, as I note above.

CHAP. III.

Of the nature of Schism.

FOR the better finding out of the nature of *Schism* in the Ecclesiastical sense and use thereof, I condescend to follow the Reverend Doctor to call the notion or notation of it, first in the naturall and proper sense. There it is taken for a division or separation of a body into parts which all men know, may admit degrees; and be either partiall when the separation or rent is partiall, the parts yet cleaving together for all that rem

total, when wholly and quite divided
 asunder. e. g. In a *cloath* or gar-
 ment cut or torne; it may be so cut or
 torne, that it may hang together by
 some *threads*, or else be divided into two
 distinct parts. Now it were ridiculous
 to say, if the *cloath* be rent, and hold by
 some *threads*, it is a *Schism*; but if it be
 quite torne asunder, it is no rent, but
 some other thing. The scripture, as well
 as sense, intimates these *degrees* of
 schism, when it sayes, the rent is made
 worse Matth. 9. 16. 2. There is a body
 politick, a City, or kingdome; and a
 schism may arise in them, either in part,
 as when their *Judgments* are divided, at
 some publick assembly as Joh. 7. 43. &c.
 Or else when they are divided into
 parties, and fall into a civil warre; both
 these met in the case of *Jeroboam*; first
 there was a division in judgment, and
 presently after a secession of parties;
 which divided the kingdome into two
 parties, and made two kingdomes of one;
 and the latter was far the worse schism.
 And it were ridiculous in *politicke* to
 say, the first was a schism or Sedition, the
 other none; yet this is asserted by one, *Moulin*
 in defence of the Reverend Doctors no-
 tion of Schism; as well as by himselfe, pag. 102.

Lud.

Moulin

Corollar.

Independency further proved,

3. There is a *body Ecclesiasticall*; whether the catholick *visibla Church*; called the *body of Christ*: or a *particular congregation*, which is a *lesser body*. The same degrees of *Schism* may fall here, either *differences in judgment*, at or without a publick *Assembly*; or *separation* into severall Churches: and it were equally *ridiculous* (as afore) to say, division in the *assembly* is a *Schism*; but *separation* into severall churches, upon those divisions, is no *Schism*. Yet this our Reverend Author; does assert; it may be some other crime, but *Schism* it is not, p. 51.

“Other crimes a man may be guilty of
 “of *Schism* onely in a Church. Whence it is evident, the Reverend Doctor begins the question from the beginning when he took it, “To denote (onely) differences of mind and judgment, &c. amongst men met in some one assembly; about the compassing of a common designe, p. 25.

The ground whereof was; because the word is sometimes, (not alwayes) so used in those places of Scripture by him cited. Whereas in the very *original* nature of the word, it may and does import, a further degree of *separation*, into parties or Churches. And the *inconsequence* of the Reverend Doctor's *Enchy-*

me hath already been discovered;
 Schism in the places cited by the Apostle,
 was a division onely in a particular as-
 sembly; Ergo Schism in the nature of it,
 does not singular separation from a
 Church.

To prosecute this a little further,
 we it is that Schism in the Ecclesiasticall
 use; signifies a separation good or bad,
 blameable or unblameable, according to
 the Circumstances (as is confessed by
 himselfe, p. 218.) which may be thus
 considered. Schism in the Ecclesiasticall
 use, is either voluntary, or violent and
 forced.

1. Voluntary, which may be double,
 1. from a false and corrupted Church,
 with which a man cannot hold commu-
 nion, without communion in their sins
 and this is commendable, and com-
 manded, "Come out from among them,
 &c. 2. from a true Church; which may
 yet be twofold; as first, a simple succes-
 sion of one or more, upon just occasions,
 to joyne with another, of the same con-
 stitution: or a separation into a new so-
 ciety, disowning the former, and renoun-
 cing communion with it. And this
 is called a blameable Schism, generally
 by all, even separatists themselves, who
 plead,

Independency further proved,

plead, they *seperate* only from a *false* or *corrupt* Church, not from a *true* one. It shall be said (as it is by the *reverend Doctor*) we *separate* not from a *true* Church, but only from some *corruptions* in it, "*which we cannot in conscience joyne with, in the celebration of publicke Ordinances as they are performed among us, as he said, p. 44.*" The answer is, that that is a *misinformed* conscience, which will *rend* the Church, the *body* of Christ, by a *causelesse* separation, as to themselves, especially having done their *dutie* to reforme that corruption, as far as lyes in them, according to *Math. 18. 15. &c.* Nothing but fear of *sinning*, justifies such a *separation*, as is elsewhere proved.

2. *Violent* or forced, and that either by the *sinfull* *corruptions* of a Church, (with which a man cannot communicate without *partaking* in their *sinns*) being *imposed* on them by a prevailing party, to enjoy *communion* with them; or by *opposition* and *persecution*, when pious people, are either *driven* out, or *kept* out of communion with them; unlesse they will submit to those *sinfull* *Impositions*: And this *Schism* is the sin of those, that any way *force* it, and they are

Church re-
formation
promoted
on Math.
13. 15. &c.

the *Schismaricks*, who caused that
 Separation. This hath often been ex-
 emplified in the Church of Rome * We say;
 our *Divines*; and the *Schism* justly ^{this Schism}
 lies at their
 door. Now our Reverend
 Author: 1. Denies any thing to be
 a *Schism* but a *Division* made by a mem-
 ber in a particular Church: 2. Confi-
 dently affirms, that Separation from
 Church, true or false is no *Schism*:
 which means he justifies, not only
 a *Sectaries*, and the *Romanists* also, but even
 their separation from the *Primitive*
apostolick Church, in *Doctrine*, *worship*
 and *discipline*. They may be *Schisma-*
 tics for their intestine divisions, if
 they will acknowledge themselves a
 particular Church, not otherwise; for
Schism is only in a particular Church:
 and thus he, who undertook to *Vindi-*
 cate the Church of *England*, and his
 own party especially, from the charge
 and crime of *Schism*, by the *Romanists*,
 hath justified them from being *Schis-*
maticall, because they are no Church.
 But now upon the former grounds, we
 may prove themselves to *Schismaticall*;
 By a voluntary separation from true
 Churches, (with whom, we dare say,
 they

* We say;
 this Schism
 lies at their
 door, who
 not only
 have devi-
 ated from
 the com-
 on faith,
 themselves;
 but doe also
 actually
 cause, and
 attempt to
 destroy tem-
 porally and
 eternally, all
 that will
 not joyn
 with them
 therein: Of
 Schism.
 pag. 144.

they may communicate without sin
 and so consequently, *causelessly* re-
 ding the body of Christ: 2. By the
renouncing communion with us, to
 up a Church of another *constitution*, and
 so *condemning* our Churches, *ipso facto*
 as no truly constituted Churches.
 3. By keeping out *fit members* from
 their communion, unlessse they will
renounce communion with us, and joy
 in a Church Covenant with them: They
 do not indeed drive us out by per-
 secution, (blessed be God it is not in
 their power; I speak of *Brownists* and
nabaptists and the *Quakers* & such like
 I mean of the *hand*, but by *tongue* they
 do abundantly; by their *cruell* *mo-
 tions*, and *ungodly railings* and *reviling*
 and by their *hereticall Doctrines*, and
blasphemous errors, they keep us out
 of their communion; and by *perswasions*
 sollicite strongly, to make *profelytes*
 and draw them into *separation* from true
 Churches, which sure in *Scripturall* and
right reason, amount to an heinous
Schism in the Church. And how
 our best *Independents* are proceeded,
 some of these, let them consider. I shall
 give an instance or two, to make the
 distinction evident. The first shall be

of Diotrephes, in Scripture, which
 the Reverend D. Hor says, p. 79. of
 Schism, "makes the neereſt approach to
 ſuch a diſſion, (from a Church) yet at
 ſuch a diſtance, that it is not at all to our
 purpoſe in hand. Let us try that a
 ſchism. I ſuppoſe the Reverend Doctor
 will not deny, but he made a *Schism*
 that Church; but that was not all;
 he noted the particulars; how he made
 not only diſſions in the Church, but a
 ſeparation from it: 1. "He withſtood the
 Apoſtle, and received him not: 2. He
 reviled him, praying againſt him with
 malicious words: 3. reſuſed to admit
 thoſe brethren (whom he knew to be fit
 members) which he ſent unto that Church
 to be admitted: 4. forbade and hindered
 thoſe that would receive them: 5. and
 caſt them out of the Church. As proper
 Schiſmatick as the Pope himſelf. For (as
 he proved) they are Schiſmaticks, who
 cauſe others to ſeparate, either by their
 unjuſt Impoſitions upon the conſcience; or
 keep them out being fit; or drive them
 out by perſecution, or caſt them out by
 excommunication unjuſtly, as well as thoſe
 who voluntarily ſeparate themſelves from
 the true Church. Next I ſhall ſuppoſe
 a caſe (which lately fell out in NEW
 ENG-

ENGLAND, and may do in OLD ENGLAND) If the Officers of Church, or the people (if the power be in them) shall raise *causelesse* differences with some one or more members of Church, and unjustly *excommunicate* them and cast them out of the Church, would not this Church be twice *Schismaticall*? once in raising *causelesse* differences in that Church, and then by unjust *casting out* and separating such from the Church, by *excommunication*, and is not here a *Schism* in separating people from a Church? therefore *schism* is more then a *division* in a Church. The like may be said, of keeping *fit members* out of a Church, denying them *communion* with that Church, in the publick *Ordinances* of God, unlessse they will *submit* to *Impositions* of men, as I said afore. And let the reverend Doctor consider, whether this be not *ordinarily* done, by some *Independent Churches*; and, if he can, deny it to be *schism*, &c.

Having thus far discovered the *nature* and extent of *schism*, I shall now consider, what *exceptions* the reverend Doctor hath made to my second Chapter. And first, I am charged with *ignorance*;

The reverend Author understood me not at all, in what I affirmed. Truly I thought I had understood him, and others so understood him as I did; and we mistook, it was long of himself. He said, "The thing whereof we treat, is a disorder, in the instituted Worship of God; that is, as I understood it, and others with me, either in the matter of instituted worship onely, (and in nothing else) or onely in the time of celebrating instituted worship. Both these parts of his words were given me by himself; the first, in Sect. 23. "The differences must be occasioned by, and do belong to some things, appertaining to the worship of God. Who would not take it thus, Schism is a difference made in the worship of God? The other, Sect. 9. "It lies wholly within the verge of one Church, that met together for the worship of God, &c. And page 25. in generall, "It denotes differences of mind and judgment amongst men, met in some one Assembly, &c. Which he repeats again in his Review, pag. 56. "Differences amongst men, met in some one Assembly, &c. and gives it for the importance of the word. Let's now hear his own sense; "I say not, that schism

" in

See pag. 91. By the
 Worship of
 God I intend, the whole compass of
 Institutions, and their tendency there-
 to, &c. If he speak properly now, I am
 sure he spake obscurely before.

“ in the Church, is either about institute
 “ Worship, or onely in the time of Worship
 “ but the thing I treat of, is a disorder
 “ in the institute
 “ Worship of God
 “ and so it is,
 “ the being an
 “ constitution

“ any Church, be a part of Gods Worship
 Had he thus exprest it at first, I profess
 (and so do others) I should lesse have
 understood him; for what means he
 That schism is onely a disorder in the
 divisions of mind and judgment, about
 the being and constitution of a Church,
 and that as it is a part of Worship? I ap-
 peal all Readers. Who, but himself
 would have found out this mystery, in
 those words? Said he not, pag. 27
 “ They had differences amongst them-
 “ selves, about unnecessary things? Is the
 institution of a Church, as a part of Wor-
 ship, an unnecessary thing? The question
 was, whether schism import onely a
 difference in one Assembly, and do not
 imply also, a separation into parties, up-
 on those divisions. Hear what he saies;
 “ I do here inform him, that if he suppose
 “ that I deny that to be a schism, where
 “ there is a separation; and that because
 “ there

there is a separation; as if schism were in its whole nature exclusive of all separation, and lost its being, when separation ensued; he hath taken my mind as rightly, as he hath done the whole designe of my book: That is, I understood him not at all. I must confesse, I did so suppose, that he did deny separation to be schism, restraining it (as he did oft) to divisions in a Church, not allowing separation from a Church, true, or false, to be a schism. Well then, he grants some separation, and because there is a separation, is a schism; and so we are agreed. No, because I have not proved it, (from the places cited) "I am desir'd not to make use of it. Let us re-
 view the places cited by me and him; shall instance onely in two, the first, Mt. 14. 4. "The multitude was divided, and some were with the Apostles, and some with the Jewes: That is, said I, they divided into parties. The reverend Doctor approves not this criticism; "The utmost intended, seems to be, the siding of the multitude, some with one, some with another, whilst they were in a publick communion. Let the Context be consulted. I said something to it, in page 40. and now I add; It seems to

pag 35.

to me to be meant of *schism*, in an Ecclesiasticall sense, (though by him brought as a *politick* schism, page 24. for thus it stands: The Apostles entered into the Synagogue of the Jewes, vers. 1. (which was a Church-Assembly) then a commotion or dissention was made, by the unbelieving Jewes, against the brethren, vers. 2. whereupon the multitude was divided; first, in minds and judgments, ἐχρίθη τὸ πλῆθος; then into parties or companies, and some were with the Apostles, some with the Jewes; which cannot wel be meant of, being or siding with the Apostles, in judgment onely, but in society also; as the like phrase is used in a like case, in a difference betwixt the Philosophers at Athens, and Paul, Act. 17. 33, 34. "Paul departed from them. Howbeit certain men cleaving unto him, believed, &c. Claving unto him, not onely in their judgments, but in their company, following him upon his departure. This will be more evident in the next Text. Act. 19. 8, 9. "Paul entering into the Synagogue, spake boldly for three months, &c. But some being hardened, and unbelieving, speaking evill of that way before the people; Paul departing from them, separated

in E. . . the disciples, teaching daily in the
 his school of one Tyrannus. Which schism
 24. . . separation was violently forced by the
 entre . . . turbulent Jewes, as I said of the other
 pers. . . instance pag. 41. And so the sin of that
 the . . . schism, was justly imputable to those
 le, b . . . Jewes, driving out the Apostle, and
 e br . . . forcing that separation. All that the re-
 itue . . . erend Doctor saies to this instance, is,
 jud . . . I confesse in the *margin*, that
 par . . . the word there used, is ἀφ' ἑαυτοῦ, which
 h th . . . hath no relation to ἑαυτοῦ. But that's
 whic . . . nothing to the purpose; for Paul was
 de . . . not guilty of that schism, but the Jewes, *Both the*
 ely . . . who enforced him to make that separa- *words fig-*
 se . . . tion, as I said above. The Romanists are *nise to se-*
 be . . . judged schismaticks by ours, because *parate, or*
 an . . . they drove and cast us out of communi- *part into*
 ri . . . on, by such like dealing with us. *pieces, as*
 ce . . . I confessed indeed, that in the Eccle- *Synony-*
 m . . . asticall sense, the word is onely used in *ma's.*
 e . . . he, 1 Cor. 1. 9. &c. (I except now
 the . . . the places newly mannaged, where the
 one . . . hath the word and the other the mat-
 ter of Schism) but I do not confesse that

therefore from thence the proper use; and *pag. 56.*
 importance of it is to be learned; This is
 put upon me; for I rather say, the full
 importance of the word, is not here to
 be learned: the word in its proper no-

Independency further proved,

tion, signifies a *breach of union*, or a *separation* into parts; in what degree I know not. And that the Reverend Doctor begs the question is evident, because he inferrs, “*That Schism being so taken in those places, Ergo it signifies more in the nature of the word, or thing*.” He knowes, I denyed both the *Antecedent* and the *consequence*; the *Antecedent* by manifesting that there was more in their *Schism*, than onely a *Division of minds*: there was division into parties, a separation with respect to severall *Ministers*, I am of *Paul &c.* and to one *Ordinance* at least, the *Lords supper*: the *Consequence*, because the word signifies besides, any sinfull *breach of union*, by separation from a true church. For the *Antecedent*, he answers; first to that of betaking themselves to divers *Ministers*, 3. things, 1. “*It is not separation in the Church, by mens divisions, continuing members of that Church, that he denies to be charged with Schism.* But if there was any separation in the church, that is more than he did grant at first; and made *Schism* onely a division of mind in that Church; and if he grant any separation in that Church, its as much as I desire; for I undertook to prove, there was more among

among them, than a bare division of
 kinds, a degree of separation, which the
 apostle there charges, as part of their
 schism; and this the Reverend Doctor
 in a manner yeelds, p. 58. For when I
 said, granting him his speciall notion, this
 the way on one hand to free all
 church-separation from Schism &c. He
 answered "This is denyed: which to me
 imports, that some separation from a
 church is Schism; which is contrary to
 his notion, that Schism is nothing but a
 division in a church, 2. "The disputes
 amongst them (sayes he) about Paul and
 Apollos, cannot possibly be understood to
 relate unto Ministers of distinct congrega-
 tion among them; Paul and Apollos
 were not so, and could not be figures of
 them that were. But theres little weight
 in this, when as the Apostle first sayes
 expressly; "He had in a figure transferred
 these things to himselfe and to Apollos
 for their sakes &c. And then the
 difference of gifts, that was in Paul and
 Apollos might suffice to make up that
 figure, as the Apostle addes; "That
 yee might learne in us, not to think of
 men (your Ministers) above that which
 is written: that no one of you, be puffed up
 for one against another: see, Chap. 3. 5.

1 Cor. 4. 6

Independency further proved,

3. He addes "*Men may cry up some*
 "*one Minister of one congregation, some*
 "*of another, and yet neither of them sepa*
 "*rate from the one, or other, or the con*
 "*gregations fall into any separation.* It
 may be so; but its very rare to find it so
 and in this case of that Church, where
 there were "*envying, and strife and*
 "*visions,* Chap. 3. 3. about their *Min*
isters, its most probable it was not so
 but people might and did *chuse* the
 owne *Teachers,* with neglect, and *sleight*
ing of others: sure we are, we find it
 now; many by *having mens persons in ad*
miracion, have separated from our
 Churches, by *crying up* some one *Min*
ister, some another, and *renouncing*
 communion with us. Its very probable
 it was so then; men that had *ickling*
eyes, heaped to themselves *Teachers*
 after their owne *lusts,* 2 Tim. 4. 3.
 This breeds *envyings* and *strife* among
Ministers, when others *steale away* the
Members, and bring *sleightings* and *con*
tempt upon their persons and *Ministry*
 and at last, a *lamentable separation,* as we
 see at this day. What ever he sayes
 against that *probability* of separation,
 little worth; for I did not undertake
 (as I said) to prove a *separation* from

that Church, but a separation in that Church, as to some Ordinances, viz. the Ministry, and Sacrament of the supper; of which in the text.

I said, there was a separation as to parties, in that Church, at least as to one Ordinance of the Lords supper: The answer is, "It is acknowledged there were disorders among them in the administration of the Lords Supper; that therein they used respects of persons: they carried not one for another: That they separated into several congregations, is not in the least intimation signified.

pag. 69.

This is as much as I undertake; that which he calls, using respect of persons in that Ordinance, excluding the poor, that I call a separation, (not from) in that Church, as to a party: This was certainly part of their schism, rebuked by the Apostle. We see this done at this day, not onely by some of his party, who will sometimes hear with us, but not receive the Sacrament with us; but also by some of our own, (if we may call them so) who admit all their Congregation to prayer and preaching, but for the Lords Supper, separate themselves into another Congregation: Is not this a schism? He knowes whom I mean.

Independency further proved,

pag 61.

That in the Church of *Corinth*, thereabouts, there was more then one *single Congregation*; I proved, first, from himselfe, who said, They had sining in their solemn *Assemblies*; not one, but many. He evades this, by saying, "suppose, one particular Congregation may have as many solemn *Assemblies* as there are times wherein they assemble. And may it not be true also, of the several places of their meetings? For that the numerous company of Believers at *Corinth*, could all meet in one place, is most improbable, if not impossible. Besides, the reverend Doctor will not deny, that the *Epistle* was written to the Church of *Cenchrea*, a distinct Church from that at *Corinth*; then were there at least two distinct *Assemblies*. To which he saies onely this; "Is there any mention, that that Church made any separation from that of *Corinth*? &c. That was not to the purpose; I brought it to prove, there were more particular Churches in *Corinth*, or thereabouts; and that, it does perform. Now is it probable, that there should be a Church in that little *Village*, and but one in that great City of *Corinth*, where were innumerable believers? I instanced there-fore

ore in that 1 Cor. 14. 34. "Let your
 women keep silence in the Churches. Not
 be, but many Churches at Corinth. It
 may be, he will answer as afore, with re-
 spect to the several times, not the several
 places of their meetings: But that is pre-
 sented, by that which I newly said.
 For sure, it might be applyed to the
 Church of Cenchrea, as well as to that
 of Corinth, supposing it to be but one
 Congregation: "Let your women keep si-
 lence in both your Congregations, when
 ever they meet. But enough of that.
 He pretends indeed to have proved,
 and to be confidently resolved, it was
 but one single Congregation; for proof,
 I find none, but what I also suppose I
 had disproved, page 30. To some things
 whereof, he saies nothing: But he is so
 liberall, as to forego that proof. "Is
 "it any thing to my present designe,
 "though there were twenty particular
 "Congregations in Corinth, supposing
 "that on any consideration, they were one
 "Church? And here he assures me, he
 is more troubled with my not understan-
 ding the businesse, and designe he ma-
 nages, then with all my reviling terms.
 The like he redoubles, page 72. "And
 "will suppose the Church to be of what
 "kind

pag. 63.

"kind I please, if I will acknowledge it. Na

"be the particular Church of Corinth. lled

As for my *revilings*, the charge is un- est

just, and I have said enough to it. Bur

Did he consider the *prejudices*, that wi

He defined fall upon his *cause*, when he granted

Schism, to these things? For 1. Supposing there

be a were many Churches

causlesse difference, amongst the mem- ches in Corinth, and

bers of any particular Church, that that but one

meet together, or ought so to do, for Church, it would

the worship of God, and celebration of plead strongly for

the same numerall Ordinances, &c. a Presbyterian, no

Of *Schism*, pag. 52. Can a particular Church, of many Churches, so meet to-

gether, to the same numerall Ord-

nances? rning for an Inde-

pendent Church:

That one Church

was governed in common, by the sever-

all *Elders*, the Apostle writing to them

all. 2. Then it were easie to infer, what

I have asserted, that the *differences* were

not in one particular Congregation, but

between Churches and Churches; about

their *Ministers*. 3. That if a Church of

many Congregations, may be *collective-*

ly called one Church, then there may

be *separations* of one Church from ano-

ther, as well as *divisions* in a particular

Congregation; and so *schism* will ex-

tend further, then he would have it. e. g.

Supposing the Church of England to be

ge it the Nationall in a right sense, and so
 printed called a particular Church, with re-
 is un- spect either to other *Nationall*, or the
 But *universall* Church; can there be no
 it will schismaticall separation made, from the
 anted *Nationall Church of England*, in the fal-
 there- ing off of one or more Churches, to A-
 Church baptism, or the like? but they must se-
 , and arate from the Church of *England*, and
 one- gne themselves to some Church in
 ould *Holland*, or elsewhere? If there may;
 y for then, separation in a Church, as well as
 no- separation from a Church, may be called
 unde- schism: For I have proved, there was a
 ch: a separation in the Church of *Corinth*, as
 ch: to some Ordinances, and that is charged
 ve- by the name of schism.

But to prevent my future mistakes of
 his principle, he tells me, what I must
 demonstrate, if I will evert it; "That
 the schism charged on the *Corinthians* by
 Paul, consisted in the separation from
 that Church, whereof they were mem-
 bers, and congregating into another, &c.
 No, that which I was to manifest, was,
 1. That schism is more then a division
 in a Church; Even separation from a
 Church, is schism. 2. That there was
 more in that schism at *Corinth*, then a
 bare division of minds; there was, if not

pag. 65.

Independency further proved,

a separation from it, into another Church, yet a separation in it, as some Ordinances. Or rather, I was, 1. To disprove his new notion; that schism is no thing, but a division of minds in a Church. 2. To prove, that supposing that schism charged on the *Corinthians*, was no more, but a division in a Church, yet it follows not, that nothing else was schism; which how I have performed let others judge.

And now we are come to Clement's Epistle, written to the Church of *Corinth* forty years after, when they were again fallen into the like schism. That schism the reverend Doctor said, was onely "the difference in the Church. This difference in it, Clement calls every where, their schism, Of schism, pag. 33. "Nor are they accused of schism, for the deposition of their Elders, but for their differences amongst themselves: Which may prove a great mistake of his, which thus I demonstrate from Clement's Epistle: First, in generall, he calls it, "That abominable and ungodly sedition, at the beginning: Afterwards, brands the Authors of it, "The heads and leaders of a detestable strife and faction, in the pride and disorderliness of their

spirit; whom those Corinthians followed. And afterwards more particularly shewes, wherein that schism consisted; viz. in casting out of their honest presbyters: "Who have of a long time had a good testimony from all men: Such, we think, cannot with any justice be cast out of their Ministry. And repeats again, and again; "Foul, beloved, and very foul, are the reports, and unbecoming, &c. that the most stayed and ancient Church of the Corinthians, by the means of one or two persons, should rise up in sedition against their Elders. Indeed it will be no small sin unto us, if we cast off those, who have unblameably and holily, undergone the duties of their Episcopacy. Then (a few lines between) follow those words, cited by the reverend Doctor, οὐκ ἔμελλεν γὰρ, &c. For we perceive, οὐκ ἔμελλεν γὰρ, ye have removed some, who performed their Office well, &c. How removed them? by casting them out, (as he said afore) or by deposing of them, as the reverend Doctor expressed it in both his Books. Now I demand, whether this deposition, or casting out of their Elders, be not the chief part of the schism, which Clement charges upon them? and whether it be not

not as great a schism in a Church, as the people, to cast out, or depose the godly Elders, as voluntarily themselves to forsake a true Church, and to set up another Church, by substituting other Officers in their places? which is more probable they did, though the reverend Doctor would not take upon him to know it, pag. 32. Of schism. This is supposed, to be intended in the word *μεταρριπναι*, which sometimes signifies to lead away, sometimes to drive away, or remove, or depose; as himself expounds it, by casting out, a little before. The reverend Doctor understood it otherwise; "What he meant by his *μεταρριπναι* &c. he declares in the words foregoing "where he calls the Elders that were departed this life, happy and blessed, as being subject to expulsion out of their Offices. But I doubt, the reverend Doctor mistakes the coherence, which seems to me rather to look at those former words, (those by him cited being rather a parenthesis) "It will be no small sin unto us, if we cast out those, who have unblamably and holily undergone their duties of Episcopacy; *ὁ γὰρ μὲν δὲ οὐ γὰρ*; for, or but, we perceive, that we have cast out, driven out, expelled, or deposed

deposed such from their Ministry, &c. This was their charge, this was part and least of their schism, and the chiefest part thereof. There was not indeed (for ought I perceive) "any separation voluntarily made from it, by any of the members thereof; but there was plainly a separation made by men, acted by pride and madnesse, in casting out, and deposing of their Elders; and they were the schismaticks, (as I said) that forced that separation. Let the learned judge.

The rest of this my second Chapter, for thirteen leaves together, the reverend Doctor thinks good to passe untouched, by some of his ordinary language; "of my prejudices, mistakes, extravagances, reflections, mean affectations to Independents; that I have not made the least attempt, towards the ever sion of what he had asserted, &c. That I have not made good the title of my book, though I scarce forget it, or any thing concerning it, but its proof, in any whole lease of my Treatise. Which imputations, how false and sleighting they are, above all in my whole book, others must judge. Could I avoid reflections upon Independents, when I had to deal with him, who is an Independent, and pleads

pleads their cause? Did I onely intend to deal with him, and not rather with the whole party, whose persons he sustains, and interest himself in their judgment, when he commonly speaks in the plurall number, "*We have separated from none of their Churches*" and many the like. And could I prove their way to be schismaticall, till I had vindicated the notion and nature of schism? Is not this whole Chapter spent in tendency thereunto? But he again complains; "*That I should so sleightly passe over that, whereon I knew, that he laid the great weight of the whole*" What was that whereon he laid the whole weight? Was it, "*That that place to the Corinthians, is the only place, where there is any mention of schism in the ecclesiasticall sense*"? Did I not (upon second thoughts) instance a place or two, (which I have now more enlarged and confirmed) where the word was used in the one, *Act. 14. 4.* and the nature of schism implied in the other, *Act. 19. 8, 9.* in an ecclesiasticall sense? Have I not clearly proved, that there were more Churches then one, in and about Corinth, to which that Epistle was written? And considering the mul-

ude of Believers in Corinth, is it not probable, if not impossible, that they could all meet in one place, to make the Church? Hath the reverend Doctor answered any thing to this? Was I to prove, *“That the evil reprov'd, was separation from it?”* No, but that there is more then a division of minds in that schism, even a separation in it, as to some ordinances; which if it be proved, as I believe it is, confutes his new notion, *That schism in its nature, and in that Church, was nothing but a division of minds, upon which the whole weight of his structure is laid.* But enough of this before, let others judge.

One thing I cannot but take notice of, *“That I would have it granted, that because schism consists in a difference amongst Church-members, therefore he that raises such a difference, whether he be a member of that Church, or any other, or no, (suppose he be a Mahometan, or a Jew) is a schismatick.”* 1. Did not prove he might be so, both from his own description of schism, and also by an instance of those, that came from Jerusalem, and stirred up divisions in the Church of Antioch? 2. For his parenthesis, is it not otherwise professed by

pag. 78.

pag. 43.

cc 39

by me, pag. 55. An Heathen cannot be a schismatick? Did not the reverend Doctor wink hard, when he would not see this? After all this, he charges it a crime upon me, "That I plead for the old definition of schism, as suitable to Scripture, after the whole foundation of it is taken away. How is the foundation of it taken away? not by his notion of schism; for though that schism has been onely a division in a particular Church, with respect to their minds and judgments; yet it followes not, that schism, in the full nature of it, is nothing else. Let him prove the consequence if he can, and not make himself ridiculous to all Divines.

But did not I instance in other words which may and do signifie separation into parties, as well as difference of minds? and those used in the same place of Scripture. What thinks he of *ἡμεῖς* *ταῖς* *ἐκκλησίαις*, 1 Cor, 3. 3. may not that signifie a division into parties? What of *ἡμεῖς* *ἐκκλησίαις* made a synonymon by the Apostle himself, 1 Cor. 11. 18, 19. with *ἡμεῖς* *ἐκκλησίαις* "I hear that there are schisms, for there must be heresies also amongst you. Now I made it evident, that that word signifies separation into severall sects

not divided onely in *opinions*, but in
Schools also, amongst the *Philosophers*;
 and why may not *schism* include as
 much? Besides, I gave other words, that
 imply a sinfull *schismaticall* separation;
 that, *Act. 20. 30.* Seducers, that speak
 perverse things, *ἀποσείωντες*, to draw away
 disciples after them, from the Church.
 That of *Heb. 10. 25.* *μὴ ἐγκαταλείψετε*
τὴν ἐκκλησίαν, *ἐν ἡμεῖς*, *ἵνα συνάγωμεν*,
καὶ ἐκκλησιασθῶμεν ὡς ἔθος ἔσται,
 Not forsaking the
 assembling of our selves together. And
 that, *Jud. v. 19.* *ἀποδιόχοντες*, separating
 themselves. All which imply a sinfull
 breach of union, and a causelisse separation
 from a true Church; which is the old
 definition of *schism*.

There are many things more of great
 importance in this Chapter, which I
 cannot but think it hard measure, to be
 so slighted and despised, as to an an-
 swer. But the reverend Doctor is so
 enamoured with his *new notion*, and so
 over-joyed with his *εὐρηκα* of inventi-
 on, that if you will not grant him that,
 he professes, to look for no successe in
 his work, as I said above. But I shall
 justly require and expect, in his next
 undertaking, a better account of them.
 There is but one thing more I shall take

notice of, in the *conclusion* of this Chapter, that is, about the *aggravations of schism*: First, those that are given by others, which I re-enforced; not because I hoped, that he would *dispute* with me about them, (for I see, he can avoid disputing about things, of greater *concernment* to him) but because I found him *disputing against* them, as I thought *causelessly*. Then for his own, he may without any leave from me, lay what *weight* he will upon them; "encouraged" (he saies) *by my approbation of them*. Truly, all the *approbation* I gave, was, that I could *agree* with him therein. But, to tell him the truth, it was rather, because they were *true*, than that they were so *pertinent* and *proper*, as those vindicated by me: For as for the three first, that it is a *despising*, 1. Of the *authority* of Christ. 2. His *wisdom*. 3. His *grace*: What hath he said, that is not *competible* to the *aggravation* of any other sin almost, as well as *schism*? The same *aggravations* may be applied to our *civill dissensions*: The last indeed is the most proper, *viz.* "Its constant growing to farther evil, in some, its Apostacy it self; its usual and certain"

ending in strife, variance, debate, evil
 furnishings, wrath, confusion, distur-
 bances, publick and private, are also to
 be laid all at its door. And that's my
 judgment, of their present Schism.

CHAP. V.

The reverend Doctor is still per-
 emptory, that the separation of any
 man or men, from a true Church, or of
 the Church from another, is not
 schism; he means, “*In the precise signi-*
fication of the word, and description of
the thing, as given by the holy Ghost.
 And what is said, to disprove that
 the word, and description of
 the thing, I shall now add; 1. He can-
 not say this of all separation from a true
 Church, for he hath granted some such
 be schism, as I shewed above, from
 58 page, where he saies, “*It is de-*

pag. 80.

nyed, that his notion of
 schism is the way, to free
 all Church-separation
 from schism: Ergo,
 some Church-separation
 schism, as I conceive.

Who told
 him, that raising causelesse dif-
 ferences in a church and then
 separating from it, is not in
 my judgment schism? p. 147.

2. In the next
 page,

Independency further proved,

page 81. he saies, "*That separation from Churches is oft-times evill, is readily granted. And before, he said, 'Causlessly to separate, is no small evill, p. 70.*" Then a *causlesse* separation from Church is evill; and why? but because it *breaks the union* of the Church, which is the very *definition* of *Schism*, commonly given. Which if it be true, how could he say indefinitely, the separation from a true Church is not *schism*? For no body saies absolutely, that all separation is schism; but a *causlesse* separation is schism; upon this reason, because it violates and rends the *union* of the Church, the body of Christ. 3. If he shall stick to the *notion* of it, in the place of the *Corinthians*, that there was only a *division* in the Church, and therefore separation from the Church is no schism, it is *incumbent* on him to prove that consequence, which yet he hath not done. In a word, I ask, What is *division of minds* in a Church a *schism*? I believe he must answer, Because it is a *breach of union*, of Christs appointment, who requires *members* of Church to be all of *one mind*. And is not an appointment of Christ, that the members

1 Cor. 1.

10.

11.

12.

13.

14.

15.

16.

17.

18.

19.

20.

members of a Church be united, as to the performance of the same *numericall* worship? Then by *parity* of reason, it follows, that to *break* that union *causessely*, is also a schism. Is not this a causelesse and worthlesse *vitiligation* of the learned Doctor?

I brought 1 *Joh.* 2. 19. for a *blameable* separation from the Church; *They went out from us*, as (said I) is the manner of *schismaticall* spirits; they stay not till they be *cast out*, but *go out*, and become the head of a faction. He ventures to say, *All Writers expound it of apostacy*: they may do so, but not excluding *schism* or *heresie*; for the same phrase of *ἐξελθόντες* *going out* is used, *Act.* 15. of those that *ἐξήλθον*. raised a schism at *Antioch*; yet were not they *apostates*, not denying *Christ*, but joyning *Moses* with Him. But I contend not.

He is as confident, that of the three places by him brought, for blameable departures from a Church, "*none of them come under the head of schism*." I said, All, or some of them do. Here I must first rectifie a *mistake* in the reverend Doctor, which he pleases himself with; *viz.* That he (not consulting the

Errata's) reads *mind* for *include*. I said

Some of them *included* the nature of *schism*, at least, as *precedaneous* to the separation. Upon which mistake, he sports himself, and adds; "*Whence*

pag. 82. "the matter is, I do not find him speak

"so faintly, and with such caution

“through his whole discourse, as in

“place. Truly I spake so *cautiously*,

his reputation, not any end of my own.

because some, one at least, of the place

speaks of no *separation* at all; viz. the

from 1 *Theff.* 5. 14. and 2 *Theff.* 3. 3.

as I prove to him; but he will not

For the first, that of *Heb.* 10. 25. wh

he takes to be meant of apostacy; I p

ved his mistake from the *Context* of

red, from others; and from himse

who formerly glossed it, neglecting

publick Assemblies: and also beca

apostates may be schismaticks, and for

thing more. For the third, *Jude* vers.

I proved the separation to be *schism*.

call, from the nature of the word

due to the judgment of learned Interpreters. To all which

ned Interpreters: To all which,
reverend Deacons which is left

nothing. And I must tell him a

again. "It was not incumbent on me

Aug. 16, again, "It was not incumbent on me

cc pro

prove, that such a separation is called schism in Scripture, and is as such a thing condemned. But that such a separation, hath the entire nature of schism in Scripture, though not the name, according to his first proposall; and that I suppose I have abundantly proved.

When I said, the pinch of the question is this, "Whether a man, or more, may separate from a true Church, upon a true or false plea, of corruption in it, and set up another Church, &c." He cries out, "I do not know, that I was ever necessitated, to a more sad and fruitless employment, &c. Is that the question in present agitation? &c. Was not this scruple started by himself? 1. In giving his definition of schism, to be onely a division of minds in a Church, and not any separation in or from it. 2. Did he not vigorously assert, in this very Chapter, pag. 77. Of schism; and here again, pag. 83. "That for a man to withdraw, or with-hold himself, from the externall communion of any Church, upon plea of its corruption in Worship, Doctrine, or Discipline, &c. is not called schism, &c. Did it not now come to be the cause of my question, which I rightly stated, as

I thought, and others think, between us and him, and his *Independent* associates? Is not their *separation* from us, the ground of all our differences? Can common honesty disallow this state of the question? Or can he truly deny, that they have made any *separation* from us, or that they do not deny our Churches? What was said afore, must be again repeated; I spake not onely of himself, but of many *Independent* Churches. Neither was my question propounded in *Hypothesis*, as respecting them; but in *Thesis*, of any *separation* from a true Church. Whether a man, or more, may *separate* from a true Church, &c. and set up another Church, &c. as afore. And have I not proved also before, that they and he, (if he stand to his principles) have, and do deny our Churches and Ordinances? Hath any man a face or conscience to deny this charge? clames *Mellicersa perisse Frontem de rebus.*

The remainder of his *Animadversions* on this Chapter, is for the most part nothing, but a repetition of those things, which he hath often charged; of mistakes, and surmises, &c. which have been

been once at least fully answered. I shall
nely lay hold of his promise, twice
made; "*That if I can prove against him,*
he should have added, or his party)
a breach of any union, instituted by Jesus
Christ, that with all speed, he will re-
treat from that state or thing, by which
he hath done so, and (in a kind of scorn)
submit to the discipline thought meet by
me, &c. Truly I think, I have proved,
that they have separated from us, and
broke the union of our Churches; and in
so doing, (if he will, as he doth, ac-
knowledge us true Churches) they have
made a breach, upon an union of
Christs institution, without which, we
are no true Churches. And now I shall
expect the performance, of so solemn a
promise. But for the contract or con-
dition adjoyned, "*That in my next re-*
ply, I deal not with him, as I have done
in my former, neither as to his person, nor
as to the differences betwixt us. I shall
promise, and have performed it; for up-
on review, of what I formerly have
done, I find, that I have dealt fairly and
respectfully with him, though perhaps
sharply, as in a zealous defence of truth.
And if he have (as he hath) dealt more

Independency further proved,
uncivilly with me in this, I shall not
retaliate, but onely vindicate the truth
as a friendly and christian adversary.

CHAP. VI, VII.

THAT I may not multiply or con-
 true *controversies* everlastingly, (as
 the reverend Doctor causlessly charge
 me) though there be some things said in
 this Chapter, not so accurately delivered
 but just acceptions might be put in
 against them; yet I shall forbear to exa-
 gitate them, and proceed to the next.
 And therein, because the main *substan-*
tiall points of our difference are alrea-
 dy discussed, and many things repeated
 which have been spoken to, I shall onely
 make some *strictures*, or animadver-
 sions, upon some passages in every Chap-
 ter, that the reverend Doctor may see
 what might have been excepted, and
 lest he should think himself *sleighted* or
 neglected, in my passing over the fol-
 lowing Chapters, though he hath sleigh-
 ted most of the *argumentative* part of
 mine, and many things of some con-
 cernment, that required an answer.

Pag. 101. "The union of the Catholick visible Church, in the profession of the saving doctrine of the Gospel, not overruled by any of the miseries, errors, or opposition to it, formerly recounted; the breach of this union is apostacy, and so no schism. To which many things were answered by me, to which little is said; what is, shall be presently considered. That which I now add, is this: 1. That the reverend Doctor opposes *apostacy* to *schism*, as if they might not both meet in one. The consequence is like the former; It is *apostacy*, *Ergo*, it is no *schism*; whereas they differ (at least sometimes) onely in degrees. 2. That he supposes, that there is no breach of union of the Catholick visible Church, but onely *apostacy*, which is usually taken for a totall relinquishing of the Christian faith. 3. That in giving those three properties of apostacy, he also supposes, that any one of them denominates a man apostate. Whereas I have proved, a breach of that union may be, 1. When a man believes not some one, of the saving doctrines of the Gospel, and yet be no apostate, 2. That a Christian may be scandalous, and yet a member still, and

see p. 101

and so no *apostate*. 3. That a man may *erre* in some necessary truth of the Gospel, and *professe* that error for a time, and yet be *Orthodox* to the rest, and be no *apostate*. And in all these cases of difference, with the *Catholick* visible Church, there may be a *schism*, or breach of *union*, and no *apostacy*. To these questions then, I say; 1. I grant, that the *Catholick visible Church*, is a collection of all professing Christians. 2. To be of such, as *profess* the doctrine of the *Gospel*, and *subjection* to Jesus Christ. 3. But I do not say, that every error in doctrine, or a *sedition* to some command of Christ, is *apostacy*, or (as he calls it) "a dissolution (totall) of that union, as to the interest of any member by it, in the body." 4. I have, and do charge some degree of *apostacy*, upon some of those Churches, which are called *Independents*, and shall be able to defend my charge. 5. I do prove, that the breach of that union, if *partiall* only, is not *apostacy*, (which is a totall forsaking of the faith of the Gospel) but rather a *schism*, which in his own definition, is a *division* in opinion and judgment. Lastly, I have manifested more,

more than so, that one of the truths of the Gospel, which all Christians are bound to, is, the joynt exercise of the same specificall Ordinances, to subjection to the same discipline; and, where it is possible, to the exercise of the same numerical Worship, which himself granted, *Of Schism*, p. 205. s. 7. and again here, pag. 109. when he saies, to my words to be; "All this was expressely affirmed by me before; it is all * virtually contained in their profession, so far as the things are revealed in the Gospel. Whereupon I interred, that the denyall of the members of the Catholick Church, to joyne in the same numerical Ordinances, was a breach of that union, and so a schism, and not apostacy. What excepts he to his own grants? "Onely as to the celebrating of the same numerical Ordinances, I again? "cannot grant, that they are obliged hereunto, as formerly considered members of that Church, nor shall, till this reverend Author shall think meet to prove, that particular Congregations, are not the institutions of Jesus Christ. If he mean by, formerly members of that Church, that professors, *quà* professors, of the same faith; or believers, *quà* believers, are

* If every professor be virtually bound by his profession, to those duties, what needs an explicate consent to bind them?

are formally members, and obliged thereunto, he granted before what now he denies, page. 205. s. 7. of *Schism*. And what I believe concerning the Institution of particular congregations by Jesus Christ I gave him my thoughts in my former page. 131. viz: the same which he granted; "Every Christian is bound to be of some particular Congregation, not of this or that: this is only of Institution; the rest is prudentiall: to which the Reverend Doctor said nothing in its place; let him now review it.

page. 111. He sayes, "As for those in A. A. 19. which had not heard, whether there were an Holy Ghost or no; its probable they were ignorant of the miraculous dispensations of the Holy Ghost, rather than of the person of the Holy Ghost. I shall onely retorne, That whatever the matter is, I find him not so cautious in all his Books; its probable, rather than, &c. For the words are more plain and full, than to be so eluded; for they were baptized in Johns baptism only; who did not Baptize into the name of the Holy Ghost for ought appears: and so they might not have heard at all, of the holy Ghost.

There

There are other particulars in his chapter deserving some *Animadversion*, but either they have been spoken to before, or they are *παλαιογὰ* to the business before us, and I shall not draw them any longer.

Page. 116. Onely something may be said to what he sayes, of the subjects of Christ the Head of the Church, which I said, some wicked men may be; He askes, Are indeed those persons any better than Mahumetans, as to Church priviledges? Shall their Baptism availe them? is it not null to them? shall such Parents give their Children any right to Church priviledges? All these were prevented and answered by me, p. 95. 96. of which the Reverend Doctor takes no notice: but repeats the same objections. And finally askes, "Doth the Apostle any where call such persons brethren? God forbid there of we should imagine these things so to be, when as the Text by me produced expressly calls such, brethren: 1 Cor. 5. 1. "If any that is called a brother, be a fornicator, &c. If that may be eluded, other cannot: 2 Thes. 13. 17. Count him not as an enemy, but admonish him as a brother. I expect that he answer my arguments.

What use is
of ex-
communica-
tion, if wic-
ked persons
be no mem-
bers of the
Church, &c.
are ipso fa-
cto unmem-
bered, &c.
as I said,

Independency further proved,

p. 119. He sayes, "I am not with

"trouble that I cannot understand, w

"he meanes, by placing my words so, a

"intimate, that I say, not onely that

"Church of Rome is no particular Church

"but also, that it is no Church at all ;

"though it might in his judgment

"mine, be any Church, if it be not a p

"rticular Church : Surely the Revere

Doctor cannot but understand the d

ference between saying, *Rome is no pa*

rticular Church, and, *no Church at all*

The mist is of his owne making ; th

will not distinguish of the word particu

lar Church ; which may be taken eithe

for a *nationall* or *patriarchal* Church, as b

himself it was, *page. 121. of Schism*; or fo

a *particular Congregation*, which is the

ordinary notion. Now though *ROME*

may be said to be no *particular Church*

as a *Congregation*; yet it may be (and is b

others) taken for a *Patriarchal* particu

lar Church : which is much more than

to say, it is no Church at all : But h

sayes, I affirme the same that he does, in

my *page. 113.* when I say "the *Hierarchi*

"call *Papall Church*, is not a Church of

"*Christs institutions*. I meant (as I ex

plain my self elsewhere,) that the *Papacy*

ed, at Papall Church, and the Church of
 d, ROME, are two distinct things, differing
 so, as the Leprosie and the hand; yet I do not
 say, the hand is no hand, because of that
 Leprosie; as he sayes, ROME is no
 Church, because its Papall, &c.

Page. 120. "Do I undertake the cause
 of the Donatists? do I labour to exempt
 them from Schism? are these the wayes
 of peace, love, and truth, he walkes in?
 appeal all Readers, whether he did not
 labour to exempt the Donatists, from
 Schism, p. 164. though he condemned
 all their practises as other crimes? And
 did he not undertake to exempt some
 others from Schism, (he knowes whom)
 that suffer with them, in former and af-
 ter ages, under the same imputation?
 And was it not upon his own new no-
 tion; because Schism is only a division
 not from, a particular Church? Yea
 was it not Schismaticall for them, to
 cast Cecilianus out of the Church, re-
 nouncing communion with him, and
 the Church of Carthage also? *ibid.* p. 17.
 8. The World hath hitherto judged it
 so; and the Reverend Doctor is now
 come off to that opinion, when he sayes
 "Do I labour to exempt them from Schism?"

which (the Rhetoricall Interrogation affirmative, being resolved) is negative. I do not labour to exempt them from *Schism*; Ergo they were *Schismaticks* in that separation. And once more, A separation from a true Church, is sometimes *Schism*, as well as *division* in it; But he sayes, angerly it seems; " *Sir, I have no singular notion of Schism, but that wch Paul long since declared.* I pray, what was Pauls notion of the *Schism* amongst the *Corinthians*? was it, that (which is yours) that *Schism* was onely a *division* in a particular Church? no; but that their *Schism* was a *division* in, that Church (with a degree of separation in it, as to some Ordinances as I have proved) not, that that comprehended the full nature of *Schism*; and if " *the notion of Schism was not at all under consideration in reference to the Donatists,* I desire him to look back to the objection which he undertooke to answer; was it not the charge of *Schism*? if not that, what else? " *Not Schism, but the union of the Church Catholick, and the breach thereof.* And what is the *breach* of the union of that Church, (in his notion) but *Apstacy* from the truth of the Gospell?

And

And would this be a congruous answer to the charge of *Schism*; to say, the *Donatists* were not *Apostates*? Did they renounce the Gospel? Nothing lesse: but renouncing communion with the catholic Church, and making themselves the only Churches in the world, they were by all men in all ages till now, accounted not *Apostates*, but *Schismaticks*: But too much of that.

Page. 123. "I and my party, (that's the Phrasæologie, this Author in his love to union, delights in) have broken the union of their Churches. I pray, is it not as equall for me to call them a partie, as for them to separate from us, and make themselves a party, renouncing communion with us? They went out from us not we from them: But it is denied, "We have no more broken the union of their Churches, than they of ours: For we began our reformation with them on even termes, and were as early at work as they. Let the READER now observe, whether the REVEREND DOCTOR do not either make, or own a party; (we) which he blam'd in me? But I adde: 1. If he looke at himselfe, he began not his reformation till after--44. vvhhen his Tract

Independency further proved,

of Pastor and People came forth, then he was a *Presbyterian* : yea till 46. vwhen he preached before the PARLIAMENT ; then he was a *Presbyterian*, and (as I hear) pleaded for that way : 2. If he looke at the *Independents* that went out of *ENGLAND*, they at first disliked nothing but our *ceremonies*, and desired no *Reformation*, but a *liberty* of conscience from those *snarcs*, as the rest of the honest *non-conformists* did, who separated not ; a *Presbyterian-reformation* would then have contented them : but in a little time, the seeds of *Brownism* were sowed amongst them ; and, for that, they were charged with *Schism* from the beginning thereof, by *moderate pious men* amongst us, 3. They (nor the Reverend Doctor) have not yet demonstrated their way to be a *reformation*, but a *deformation* of our Churches ; though sometimes for *shame* of the World, they call us *true Churches* ; which they contradict by separating from us, and *renouncing* communion, as Churches, with us : 4. vwhen we began to reforme, (by *authority* of the *Magistrate*, which they did not) some of his party cast all the *blocks* they could in our way, and gathered

gathered Churches from us. And though he deny it, that they (he saies, we) have separated from all the reformed Churches, as no Churches; and himself with them in his principles, if not in practise; is so fully demonstrated above, to all reasonable men, that I wonder that he should expect "*recompence and satisfaction, for calumniating-accusations and slanders*, which are proved truths; and talk of his *forgivnesse* of one, that never wronged him. For the parallel of *Independentism* and *Donatism*, how much he or his party is concerned, let others judge.

Pag. 126. He cavills at my first proof, that there may be a *breach of union* in the Catholick visible Church, if the *form* of it were faulty. But what is wanting to make up a perfect *Syllogism*, might easily have been supplied, from the former *discourse*, by himself, if he had pleased; thus: 1. *Schism* is the *breach of union* in a Church, of Christs institution: But the Catholick Church is a Church of Christs institution; *Ergo*, there may be a *schism* in the Catholick Church. 2. There may be *differences* in matter of faith professed, which is the *union* of the

Catholick Church; *Ergo*, there may be *schism* in the Catholick Church, which not arising to *apostacy*, must needs be *schism*, as I proved above: And he must *evade*, by one of those answers which I presented to him, *pag.* 115. or else must *beg the question*. For a close of this; Can there be any *breach of union*, in the nature of the word, in the language of Scripture, or in reason of common sense, which is not a *schism*, more or lesse, according to the degree of that *breach of union*? But to the second, he saies, “Two professors may fall out, and
 “differ, and yet continue both professors
 “still; Paul and Barnabas did so, so
 “Chrysostom and Epiphanius, &c.
 This *breach of union* in Paul and Barnabas, professors of no particular Church; that of Chrysostom and Epiphanius, of severall Churches: Was it not a fault in one party? both could not be in the right. What, will he call that *breach of union*? Surely not *apostacy*, (for they were, he saies, professors still) they were far from *renouncing* the profession of the Gospel, either of them. What then was it, but a *schism*, and sinfull separation in one party? And nothing hinders

ΑΑ. 15. 39
 ἐγένετο
 παρόξυσ-
 μος, ὥς ἐ-
 ἀποχωρι-
 ᾶναι
 αὐτοὺς
 ἀπ’ ἀλ-
 λήλων.

hinders to call it so, but onely the reverend Doctor's *new notion* of schism, to be onely a *division* in a particular Church.

Pag. 128. and the two following pages, are filled with little to purpose, but with charges, "of evill surmises, reproaches, "false criminations, wranglings, impertinencies, bitterness of spirit, &c. which are almost an hundred times repeated, but not once proved: He concludes with the *guilt* of one of my charges, that is, *falsehood*, when he saies, "I am glad "to find him, pag. 120. renouncing Ordination, from the authority of the "Church of Rome, as such: For I am assured, that in so doing, he can claim it "no way from, by, or through Rome; for "nothing came to us from thence, but what "came in and by the authority of that "Church. I might cry out of mistakes, calumniation, or equivocations, &c. for neglecting to observe my distinction, given before and after; before: "They "baptized and ordained, not as Antichristian, not as Bishops, or Romish Priests, "but as Presbyters. After, in the next page; "They did it as Officers, not as Officers of that Church, that Papall Antichristian

Independency further proved,

christian Hierarchy. From whence I said, "*It is false then, that (which he had charged, pag. 199.) that Ordination is pleaded, from the authority of the Church of Rome, as such: That is, as Antichristian.* And I say again, his last words are false; "*That nothing came to us from thence, but what came in, and by, the authority of that Church,* if he mean, the Antichristian Church of Rome. To conclude, he often professes, he hath not renounced his Ordination, by an English Bishop; that Bishop had his successive Ordination from some that had it from Rome. Yet he could distinguish a double capacity of those Bishops, one as *Lord Bishops, pag. 227.* another as *Ministers of the Gospel, &c. pag. 231.* Now if he renounce not his Ordination, he will deny, that he received it from *Bishops, as such; but from them as Ministers of the Gospel.* And may not we distinguish so of the *Romish Bishops?* is it not ordinary for all our *Divines* so to distinguish? What perversnesse is this! The businesse about Ordination of our Ministers, required his judgment and answer; but he thinks best to wave it, though it was started by himself, p. 196.

pag. 131. I am causlessly quarell'd
 , for calling his *description* of a parti-
 cular Church, a *definition*; and he saies,
 He waved contests about accurate defi-
 nitions, which usually tend very little,
 to the discovery or establishment of truth.
 both which, I wonder at, in so great a
 logician: For 1. Is not a *description* in
 logick call'd, an imperfect definition?
 The contests amongst men, often-
 times grow from want of a perfect defi-
 nition. The true *Genus*, and proper *diffe-*
rentia, being the clearest way to disco-
 ver, and establish the truth. And this
 is evident, by his own *description* of a
 particular Church: Is it not a *definition*,
 consisting of a *Genus*, a society of men
 called by the word; and a *differentia*,
 the joynt performance of the worship of
 God, in the same individuall Ordi-
 nances, &c? Did he not make the *form*
 of a particular Church to be, "The
 observance and performance of the same
 Ordinances of Worship, numerically, &c.
 pag. 236. And do not both those make
 up a *definition*? Whether it be accurate
 or no, is now to be considered. And that
 it is not a perfect or full definition, or
 description, appears from what I
 said,

said, pag. 123. because it is applicable to the *Church invisible*, and to the *visible* Catholick Church, as well as to a particular Congregation. Each, or all these, may be described to be "*a society of men, called out of the world, by the Word, &c.*" according to all the particulars of his description, as hath been evidenced by me, and acknowledged by himself above? And I added, "*These are such societies as are all our particular Congregations*;" and so, as true Churches are theirs. To which he saies but this, "*That was not the thing in question.*" If it was not there, it is (he knowes) a question between them and us; and my inference was rationally, from his description, A particular Church is a society, &c. But ours are such; Ergo, true Churches and consequently, not (without schism) to be separated from.

Pag. 132. Concerning the explicit covenant, so much urged by them, he saies, "*I am not at all concerned in it*;" "*purposely waved all expressions concerning it, one way or other, &c.*" But did he not give us the form of a particular Church, and the union of it, to consist "*in a joynt consent of the members, to walke*"

together, &c. see pag. 142. of Review?
 not by them made the very form of M. Hoo-
 ker Survey
 particular Church, without which,
 can no more be a member of a par-
 ticular Church, then a woman can be
 with a mans wife, without her explicite
 consent? I noted the difference of his
 expression; one while he said, The form
 of a particular Church, was the joyn-
 t consent of the members; another while,
 it is the joyn-observance of all Ordina-
 nces of worship, numerically, &c. Now
 this is evident, that these are not the same
 thing; there may be a joyn-observance
 of the same Ordinances numerically, by
 members of severall Churches, mee-
 ting together; yea, by members of the
 Catholick Church, yet of no particular
 Church, by joyn- consent. And this latter,
 is the joyn- performance of the same Ordi-
 nances of worship numerically, is the
 form (if it have any) of a particular
 Church, differencing it from the other.
 This diversity of expressions, the reve-
 rend Doctor puts off; first, with a sleigh-
 ting sentence, *Id populus curat scilicet*;
 and then evades, by asking; "Is it the pag. 144.
 command of Christ, that believers should
 so do? Is not their obedience to that com-
 mand,

See p. 145.
As an ex-
presse con-
sent, &c.

“mand, their consent so to do? Is it
 “the duty of every one, to joyne himself
 “some one of the Churches? Can any
 “do so, without his consenting so to
 “Is this consent any thing, but his vol-
 “untary submission, to the Ordinances
 “worship therein? Let me ask but so
 like questions; What’s all this to
 purpose? what to an *explicite* coven-
 or consent, which they require? May
 not all this be done *implicitly*, and be
 sufficient, in their own confession,
 make a Church? Did not he say, “
 “this was *virtualy* contained in their pro-
 fession so far, as the things mentioned
 “revealed in the Gospell, pag. 10
 When a man first professes himself
 Christian, he *virtually* and *implicitely*
 promises to do all those duties, which
 concern him, in any relation to his fellow
 members, and Minister: What need
 then, to lay so much weight upon an *ex-
 plicite* Covenant, (unlesse sometimes in a
 prudentiall way, when a Church renew
 the generall Covenant; or to bind me
 faster, to what they were bound to be-
 fore, but neglected) I say, what need
 there, to lay the whole weight of
 Church-constitution, (as no Church
 without

without it) upon an explicate covenant
 when the *implicite* is confess'd sufficient.
 These things should not have been
 moved, or sleighted by him, that makes
 the form of a particular *Church*, to be
 bynt consent : by which, if he mean
 an explicate consent or covenant,
 speaks nothing to the difference be-
 tween us, and ratifies the constituti-
 on of our Churches, as well as his

ibid : "*I thinke no one single congrega-
 tion is wholly compleated according to
 the mind of Christ, unlesse there be more
 Elders than one in it ; there should be El-
 ders in every Church. What meanes
 by Elders in every Church ? a Pastor
 and a Teacher ? can he prove the Apostle
 for two such Elders in every Church ?
 are both these so necessary in every
 Church, that without them, it is no
 Church ? Or does he meane, every
 Church must have, beside those two,
 ruling Elders in it ? Can he prove there
 were such at E P H E S U S, Act. 20. 17.
 and they sent for, by the Apostle ; He
 speaks to them as more than one or two,
 on all, v. 25. He may tell us in the next,
 how many Elders, according to the mind
 of*

Anat of
Indepen-
dent page.
26.

of Christ, *complete* a Church ; and how
he will reconcile the whole difference
as to their and our Churches : remember
bring this, that as Mr. Simpson had
Ruling Elders, nor did approve of the
in his Church : So I do not know whether
the Independent Church at Oxford
have any such *Elders*, or no,

Page. 134. " I am so farre from con-
" firming baptism subjectively to a parti-
" cular Church, that I do not believe, that
" any member of a particular Church
" was ever regularly baptized : Baptism
" precedes admission into Church-members-
" ship, as to a particular Church : the sub-
" ject of it, is professing believers, and their
" seed, whether joyned to any particular
" Church or no. I must confesse, I know
not how to take these words : 1. It
seems at first sight to conclude, that
himself and the generality of Christians
in ENGLAND were never regularly
baptized, being baptized all, in some
particular Church : 2. It sounds some-
thing Anabaptisticall, that a Church is
made of baptized persons ; baptism pre-
cedes admission into Church mem-
bership, (say they also) as to a particular
Church ; and denying Infant baptism to be

valid, they re-baptize men, before they
 admit them members of their Church : *Of Schism*
 This is contradicted by the brethren *p. 85. 208.*
 NEW ENGLAND, who make a *These churches were*
(by Jesus
 particular Church only, the Seat of all *Christ)*
 ordinances, and none to be regularly bap- *made the*
 tized, that are not baptized in a parti- *only Seate*
 cular Church : 4. The same is asserted *of that*
 himself ; page. 106. of his *Review :* *worship,*
particular Churches, being by the will of which in
God appoynted for the Seat of Ordinan- *particular*
ces. Then, unless baptism be no Church he expresse
Ordinance of God, it must be done in a ed his will
particular Church. But he sayes, " for to have
his present mistake, I shall not complain continued
seeing that some occasion may be admini- untill he
stred to it; from an expression of mine ; came, &c.
 which we find to be this : " *Christ hath*
given no direction for any duty of wor-
ship, but only to them and by them who are
so joyned, Of Schism, page. 206. s. 10.
 Whereupon I asked, whether baptism
 was a part of worship ? If so, how could
 he reconcile this with what he said a-
 fore, " *that members of the Catholick*
Church are initiated into that profession
by Baptism : For if a professor of the
 catholick Church only, may be baptized,
 how is a particular Church, the Seat of
 ali

all Ordinances? and so to be performed by them that are so joyned? To rectify not mine, but his own mistake he now sayes: "*Baptism is so to be performed*" "*them, that is a Minister in or of them*" Page. 136. How easily might I mistake when himself mistook, and lead me out of the way: And will this make me ever the wiser? The thing he had to prove was "*the necessity of every believer's joyning to some one particular Church,*" "*enjoy the Ordinances of the Gospell:*" This he proves, "*because Christ hath given*" "*direction for the performance of any duty*" "*of worship of Sovereign institution, but*" "*only in them (the particular Churches)*" "*and by them, who are so joyned.*" He recommends it, till it is the worse again? If he would imply, that a Minister in or of a particular Church may perform those ordinances, without those congregations, (which onely was to purpose) he contradicts himself for saying, A particular Church, is the seat of all Ordinances. If he meane, those Ordinances of worship, are to be performed only by a Minister of a particular Congregation, what shall become of the people? and what made the words, *so joyned here*? Does it

not

form not concern them to worship God? Or
 ediff may a Minister perform any acts of wor-
 ne no ship, out of a particular Church? That I
 med said, was denied by men of his way, that
 them Minister is such to any more than his
 mistake own Church: He asks me; "Who
 ne ou told me he denies a Minister, to be a Mi-
 me nister to more than his own Church, &c.
 prom age. 135. I have been told (and I pre-
 s jomume he will not deny it) that when the
 b, learned DOCTOR WALLIS, had
 This brought to him as Vicechancellor, that
 en m Question to be defended negative, in the
 dur pspers of the publick Act at Oxford,
 bu 2654. "*An potestas Ministri evangelici,*
 ves "*ad unius tantum Ecclesie particularis*
 He "*membrum extendatur*, this Reverend
 f he Doctor said thereupon, that Doctor Wal-
 of is had brought him a challenge, adding,
 or that if he did dispute upon that Questi-
 on, he must dispute *ex animo*. And if this
 be true, as I presume it is, what need I be
 lar further told, that he denies a Minister
 s to be a Minister to more, than his par-
 or- ticular congregation? I have also been
 i- told further (which I presume he will
 at not deny neither) that when Doctor
 t Wallis's? *Thesis* on that Question,

Independency further proved,

was since printed, this Reverend Doctor
 did imploy, or at least encourage (an *Antichristian*
manuensis of his) Mr. *Stubbs* of Christ
 Church (now advocate for Mr. *Hobbes*)
 to write against it: Though indeed, when
 that work written, was found a *Scurrilous*
ridiculous piece (for so I heare, he
 is since pleased to style it) he did not
 thinke fit to let it be made publick, be-
 cause (they were his own words,) "*he*
would not have that cause suffer so much
as to be defended by such a Penne. I have
 heard more, to this purpose, but I for-
 get: Only I shall (to shew his *Incon-*
sistency to himself) let the Reader know
 how liberally he now grants, "*Mini-*
steriall Acts may be performed not only
to the members of the Catholick Church,
but to the visible members of the world
also. I leave him and his friends to de-
 bate and reconcile themselves one to ano-
 ther in this.

Page. 136. "*Prayer and reading the*
Word in private families are parts of wor-
ship, but not meerely and purely of Sove-
raign institution: These are expressely
 commanded; *Dut. 6, 7, 8, &c.* I shall
 not follow him in the rest; only where-
 as he complements with me in so high a
 mode;

mode; p. 139. "I would humbly intreat
 this reverend Author, to send me his
 reasons, whereby it may be confirmed, viz.)
 that there must be particular Churches,
 or every professor to joyn with, one
 or other, for the celebrating of publick
 Ordinances. I as humbly desire him to
 review my 132, page. &c. and to consider
 my reasons, if they be not as good
 as his and what therein is of *Institu-*
tion.

3. "Preaching to convert Heathens is
 not (as described) a duty of worship in all
 cases; and when it is, it is to be performed
 by a Minister. What meanes he by
 those words, as described? my words
 were; "preaching to convert Heathens
 and then to baptize them; is it not a
 duty of worship belonging to a Mini-
 ster? is there any preaching properly so
 called, that is not a duty of worship? or
 may any do it but a Minister? Rom. 10.

14. In his *Tract of Pastor and People*; he
 allowed, in extraordinary cases, any
 man that had gifts and a people willing
 to hear him, to be a Preacher; Is that
 one of the cases, when preaching to
 convert Heathens is not a duty of wor-

worship, and ~~not~~ belonging to a Minister? Or is it that parenthesis of mine; (and then to baptize them, when converted) that makes it a duty of worship, and to be performed by a Minister? I humbly conceive, this answer is somewhat obscure, and satisfies not my fourth, concerning himself, when I asked, “By what authority he himself Preaches, and Prays too? and with the Parliament, &c. Or are not those, there done, parts of worship which he calls an invidious enquiry, and so passes it by. It required an answer, whether he accounts those to be particular Congregations, that are mixt and unjoynd? Whether he performed those as duties of worship, as a Minister; and by vertue of what Ordination, if he have not renounced it, as, he saith, he hath not? especially, if he was not Ordained in a particular Church? Of which, in the next.

Pag. 138. “My judgment is, that ordinary Officers are firstly to be ordained, in particular Churches. I onely ask, in what particular Church himself was ordained? and if he was, whether he did

did not first renounce his former Ordination by a Bishop, which he hath so oft consented to have done? For I do not expect him to say, he is an extraordinary Officer. And if ordinary Officers be onely ordained in a particular Church, it would be resolved, how he can do any Ministeriall act, to any other particular Church, or to the Catholick Church, or World, which he granted above? And then, how those that are members of that particular Church, are not confined to him, as well as he to them? Pastor and Flock being such Relations, as Husband and Wife. This piece of Independency was a matter of great contest in new England, by one that was no child in those things: whether the practise of those in old England be otherwise, I know not; if it be, I doubt, it is onely to such members, as are of some Church of the same constitution; which is something lesse, but no whit better, as to our communion with them.

Pag. 140. If the discourse about the intercession of Ordinances, and all Church-state, was an impertinency, it

was his own fault; to start it thrice
 pag. 85. and 211. and 271. and a greater
 fault to wave it here: Onely, we have
 promise, *"That in convenient time, he*
"may offer somewhat further, towards
"the investigation of the mind of God
"therein; and it becomes me to wait
his leisure: "It is not a matter to be tossed
"up and down, in this scrambling chase
 Yet, as I said, he insinuated in his
 question, that England was unchurch'd
 and the Churches planted here did cease
 to be; and tells us, by what act God did
 unchurch them: But now waves to an-
 swer all my seven questions, (which re-
 quired an answer) but the last; to
 which a sufficient reply is made, (where
 it was unseasonably brought in) upon
 his first Chapter, to which I refer him.
 Onely I take notice, of his introduction
 to his answer, *"with thanks for the*
"civility of the enquiry, in the manner of
"its expression. My words were these,
Whether our reverend Author do not in
"his conscience think, there were no true
"Churches in England, till, &c. which
 puts me into a suspicion, that the re-
 verend Doctor was offended, that I did

Ad. p. 21.

not alwaies (for oft I do) give him that
 title, of the *reverend Author*, or *reverend*
Doctor; which made him so cry out,
He was never so dealt with, by any par-
ty, as by me; though upon review, I
do not find, that I gave him any uncivill
language, unbeseeming me to give, or
him to receive: And I hear, that some
body hath dealt more uncivilly with
him in that respect, which he took very
ill.

Pag. 148. "For my part, I am not ac-
 quainted with those *Independents*, which
 "allow no communion of Churches, but
 "what is prudentiall. It seems, the re-
 verend Doctor is little acquainted with
 the principles of the *Independents*, in
 new and old *England*; yea, he consi-
 ders not the very name of an *Indepen-*
dent Church, which what doth it signi-
 fie, but an *Independency*, or non-commu-
 nion of one Church with another, as
 Churches, as I noted, pag. 135. at least
 of divine institution. The rest, what is
 it but prudentiall, or communion of
 members of the *Catholick Church*?
 And I shall onely propound this to his
 consideration: 1. Whether if there be

any *communion* of Churches, as Churches, (which he grants, or else equivocates) there be not a *breach* of that communion and union, (and so a *schism*)

“ When one Church refuses to hold the
 “ *communion* with another, which ought
 “ to be between them; which before, and
 now, he denies: “ it is no *schism*, properly
 “ ly so called: Unless he mean, it is not
 properly so called, with respect to his
 new notion of *schism*. But now he is
 upon the *common* notion of *schism*, a
breach of union or unity; and then it is
 a *schism*, to refuse that communion,
 which ought (by divine appointment)
 to be between them. 2. They having
 acknowledged our Churches to be true
 Churches, and then some *communion*
 to be due to us, as Churches; how can
 they separate from us, and refuse *com-*
munion with us, without a *breach of*
union, and so without *schism*? unless
 he mean, they allow *communion* of their
 own Churches, by institution of Christ,
 but not with ours; no not so much as
prudentiall, as Churches. 3. Many *In-*
dependents (and the reverend Doctor
 with them) seem to hold, that *commu-*

tion of Churches by *Delegates*, in
 a *Council* or *Synod*, is onely pruden-
 tiall, and not of *Christs* institution;
 and then he may mean, there is no
 breach of union, in refusing to hold
 that *communion*, because it is not an
 union or communion of *Christs* in-
 stitution. To conclude this, how
 little reason the reverend Doctor
 had, to cry out of *outragiuous* injury
 done him, in those words of mine;
 "Is not the designe of his Book to prove,
 "if he could, and condemn us as no
 "Churches? Let the world be judge.
 When he hath often told us, that
 in separation from us, they have bro-
 ken no union of *Christs* institution;
 as I have often said. And here tells
 us, "I have no more separated from
 "you, than you have done from me: Of schism,
 Which how unreasonably (I will not
 say, *outragiously*) fals it is, I say again,
 let the world, and *Saints*, and who wil,
 be judge. And then consider, what
 need there was, of his "forgivnesse;
 "of all my reproaches, revilings, &c.
 which appear to be none. But
 though I am unjustly charged all
 along,

along, with such miscarriages, the reverend Doctor "shall have a place
"in my heart and prayers. And so much of his ninth Chapter.

Pag. 146. "What Independentsism
"is, he doth neither here declare, nor
"d; I know what it is that he intends
"by it; the name is invidiously broa-
"ched, and disowned by them to whom
"it is ascribed, &c. But 1. The re-
verend Doctor is very forgetfull, of
what he saies; for he told us once
before, pag. 47. "Though he name
"not that party, yet it is evident whom
"he intends. And once again, pag.
148. "What Sect it is, any man may
"judge, that takes the least view of his
"Treatise. My Treatise was intended
against all sorts of Independents, and
against himself as one of them; for
they all plead their Congregations to
be Independent, having all Church-
power within themselves, that de-
nominates them all Independents,
though they otherwise differ one
from another. 2. That invidious
name, however disowned by them,
was first of their own invention, and
by

See Anat. of Indep. p. 37, 38.

by practise, (as well as by the former Doctrine) arrogated to themselves. They all agree also in separation from our Churches; they unchurch our Churches, unminister our Ministers, &c. pag. 148. With such I deal. He asks, "Is this Independen-
tism a schism, properly so called?" I hope he did not expect, that I should plead for it. I deny that I unminister their Ministers, &c. How he can with conscience deny this, of most of the Sects of Independents, I much wonder; not onely Anabaptists, but some of his own way, not yet gone so far, do separate from our Churches, unminister our Ministers, &c. And his own principles do the same, and will ere long lead him thither, as I have abundantly proved. But what means he by Independenism?

Pag. 149. "If by Independenism he understands, the peaceable proceeding of any of the people of God, in this Nation, in the severall parts of it, to joine themselves, by their free consent, to walk together in the observation of all the Ordinances of Christ,

Independency further proved,

“ Christ, appointed to be observed in
 “ particular Churches, so to reform
 “ themselves from some disorders
 “ wherein they were entangled, being
 “ not able in some things, to joyne
 “ in the presbyterian way of reforma-
 “ tion, without judging and condem-
 “ ning them, as to the whole of their
 “ station and Ordinances; when it shall
 “ be proved schism, it shall be attended
 “ to. The like is repeated again,
 pag. 160. with some little diffe-
 rence; for such, onely he pleads.
 Now to speak in the reverend Do-
 ctors mode, I humbly beseech this
 reverend Author, seriously to con-
 sider, what he hath said, and whom
 he pleads for: 1. Whether he do
 not plead for all the Sects in the
 Nation, as to the whole of this,
 (except one particular, of which by
 and by)? Do they not all plead a
 peaceable proceeding of (themselves)
 the people of God, to joyne toge-
 ther by their free consent, to walk
 together in the observation of all the
 Ordinances, &c? to reform them-
 selves from disorders, as not able

to joyne in the way of presbyterian
reformation? &c. 2. Will he call
that a peaceable proceeding, which
being done without the authority of
the Christian civill Magistrate, and
to the disturbance of all the Churches
of the Nation? 3. Were it
granted, that in the first constitution
of a Church, people
might, by their own free
consent, joyneto walk
together, &c. Is this
course tolerable in settled
Churches, without
“fusion, and overthrow-
ing of the very constitution of
“Churches, &c? as he said else-
where, *Duty of Pastor and People*,
pag. 53. (to which I have spoken, in
the end of my second Chapter a-
bove) unlesse he will deny us now to
be true Churches. May not the mem-
bers of his own Church, upon some
 disorders of it, (as they can easily
conceive) have the same liberty to
separate from them, and joyne by
free consent together, to set up ano-
ther Church? Nay, do they not take
that

* So he

seems to mean, pag. 160.
when he speaks of Mem-
bers of the Catholick
Church, both invisable
and visible, to be joynd
in particular Churches.

that liberty? and notwithstanding all the bonds and fetters of free consent, and explicit covenant to continue with them, desert them upon this very principle, and joine themselves with Anabaptists, and other Sects? 4. And do they not all break the last condition, "judging and condemning the present way of reformation, as to the whole of their station and Ordinances?" Will the reverend Doctor put out the eyes of all men, but his own?

Nothing but apparent sin, in the way of performance of morall duties, can excuse the withdrawing from them, when occasion of enjoying is offered. Robinl. Treat. of lawfulness of hearing English Ministers, pag. 6. See also pag. 17, and his Apol. pag. 87.

Lastly, I leave it to his own consideration, whether it be lawful for people, that are members of true Churches, (as ours are acknowledged to be) upon some disorders in a Church, or pretence of reforming themselves, to separate from that Church, and to erect another; when as they have done their duty to reform it, in those disorders; notwithstanding which, they may withdraw sin, communicate with that Church?

Church? but rather to breake true
Churches into pieces, than to bear
with some inconveniences. And I
desire a *president* of such a practise in
scripture or story.

Page. 156. "*When they and we be-
gan to reforme, thousands of the peo-
ple of God in this nation, had no rea-
son to suppose themselves to belong to
one particular Church rather than
another; they lived in one Parish,
heard in another. If they did not
suppose themselves to be of some
particular Church, it was their error
and their fault; their error because
all the people of the Nation, were
confined to that Church where they li-
ved; and lyable to censure for leaving
that Church, for partaking of Ordi-
nances; and the Ministers for admit-
ting them: Their fault, because they
were bound by way of duty, both by
the *Laws* of the Nation, and also by
the *Law* of God, to be of one or o-
ther particular Congregation; as the
Reverend Doctor hath oft asserted;
and this disorder to be of no one con-
gregation, would not be indured in
any*

any of their members. The *bondage* only was that they are obliged to be members, where the Ordinances were not at all or sinfully administered : In my eighth Chapter, he leaps over above twenty leaves at once.

Page. 154. I had said, our Churches under the *Prelates*, were not capable of *reduction* to the primitive institution ; whereupon he professed “ he could not looke upon such societies as Churches of Christ. Which (said I) was to *unchurch* all our Churches, since the Reformation : He answers, “ The Churches of ENGLAND were “ capable of that *reduction* under the “ Prelates, though in some things hindered by them, from an actual *reduction*. Doth this become the Doctor’s *ingenuity*? So are the Churches of ROME capable *potentia remota*, to be reduced to the primitive institution : but so hindered by some body, that he that should go about it, would find the actually *unable* of such *reduction* : So are our Churches capable of such a *reduction* ; and it is *probable*,
had

had been reduced to the primitive institution ere this, but he knows we have obstructed it: as I told him before: yea that, "perfect liberty for reformation, or rather toleration of all Religions, is the greatest Impediment to our Reformation; and whilst it continues, will render us more incapable of Reduction to the primitive institution: Whilst our people have so much liberty to be of any, or no Religion, no Reformation is possible; and yet vve are potentially capable of that reduction: And the Reverend Doctor's advice, given before and novv againe, page. 270. of *Schism*? "that people take some other peaceable way; to make themselves partakers of those purchased priviledges, &c. comes both too late, for they have done it already by separation from us; and also unreasonably, because if it be taken, it renders us more incapable of that Reformation desired, by withdrawing the best and most reformed of our members from us, and leaves us but few beside those that hate to be reformed.

Page. 166. Beside the "radicall
L "union

146 *Independency further proved,*

“union (as he calls it, page. 96. of
 “Schism?) of the Church Catholick;
 “invisible in it selfe, and with its
 “head; there is (as he tells us also, pag.
 97.) “another consequentiall union,
 “with peculiar reference to the mem-
 “bers themselves, and that is the mutual
 “love of all those united in the Head;
 “towards one another, &c. Now
 though he cannot break the radisall
 union with the Head; he may
 breake the consequentiall union
 or consequence of that union,
 which consists in mutuall love. Paul
 and Barnabas fell into difference, and
 separation one from another; yet
 were, no doubt, true members of the
Invisible Church, (though not of a-
 ny particular Church) and this was
 at least some degree of breach of that
 mutuall love and peace, that ought to
 have been between them; hereupon
 it was that I said, “unlesse the Reve-
 “rend Doctor think there are no mem-
 “bers of this Church in ENGLAND,
 “but these that are of his formed par-
 “ticular Congregations, I feare he
 “will be found to break the union, that
 “ought to be between them. He is grie-
 ved

red he sayes, at this my declaration ;
*because the union of the members of
 this Church in this sense, consists in
 their joynt union to, and with Christ
 their head, by one spirit, concealing
 the other, of mutuall love, which I
 intended : Now when the Reverend
 Doctor or some Churches of his par-
 ty, have separated from some whom
 they acknowledge truly godly ; and
 keep them out of communion with
 themselves, in their Churches, unless
 they will give a consent to be mem-
 bers of that Church, by an explicate
 covenant (he knowes where this was
 practised) I shall say again, here was
 a breach of union, that ought to be
 between the members of that catho-
 lick Church : It is not his saying,
 " that he does not think, all the mem-
 " bers of that Church are comprised
 " in their Churches or ours, that will
 help it (who made the first division,
 they or we, is well known) : but it is
 the deny all of communion with such
 members, on the termes aforesaid, that
 breaks the union of mutuall love, be-
 tween those members.*

Page.

Page. 167. I had said; By gathering
 Saints of the greatest magnitude, they
 do what they can to make the *Invi-*
sible Church visible. He answers
 “ *It is confessed we do so; This, with all*
 “ *that lies in us, we draw them unto.*
 And truly, it is our care and indea-
 your to make all our visible profes-
 sours, invisible true *believers*: But
 this is not their way: They do not,
 (as we do) labour to make *bare profes-*
sours (meere naturall men, of their
 own *Congregations*) to be reall belie-
 vers for they pretend to admit none
 such, if they know them) but they
un-easomably and unjustly gather, or
 rather steal, our best professors, and
 reall believers, to make a Church *vi-*
sible, of invisible members, a Church
 of all *elect* ones. Which course, as it
 is not to be exemplified in *all* Scrip-
 ture, or storie; So it is *forespoken* by
 Christ himself, not to be accompli-
 shed; who hath told us, “ *the Wheate*
 “ *and the Tares, the Goates and the*
 “ *Sheep, must be mixt together in the*
 “ *Church, till the great day of finall*
 “ *separation?* and we doubt not, but
 they

they find the *impossibility* of effecting that *designe*, when they and the world sees, they have in their Churches some *hypocrites*, and some as loose, as in some of ours: And their *arrogance*, in presuming against the *predictions* and *providence* of Christ, to *build* a Church, that should reach unto Heaven on Earth, hath been fearfully *blasted* (as another *Babel*) with *confusion*, by their members, falling into *damnable* errors, and *abominable* profaneness, as I said else-where. Even some *Independent* Churches, which he too much countenances, if he be not a *member* of them, may easily be proved, in his own judgment to be *hereticall*, if *Arminianism*, and some points of *Popery*, be with him accounted *Heresies*: I need not instance.

Pag. 168. "As to the worship established in this Nation, for the substantialls, we are all agreed in: I suppose, he will not say, a relinquishment of the practise of it, is a schism; if he do, I know what use some men will make of his affirmation, though I

See p. 171. "know not how he will free himself,
 "from being Schismaticall. Truly, as
 easily, as the reverend Doctor can
 free himself from that charge of
 schism. We have not relinquished
 the *Worship*, established by Law, as to
 the *substantialls* of our *Worship*,
 (the *Episcopall* men joyne with us,
 and we with them therein) but in
 the *externall formalities*, and *ceremo-*
niall circumstances of that worship;
 which (as he saies somewhere) were
 laid aside by other hands. But they re-
 nounce *communion* with us, in the
substantialls of worship, and erect
 other *Churches*; and that we judge to
 be schismaticall.

Pag. 169. "When most of us recei-
 "ved our new birth in England,
 "through the preaching of the Word,
 "neither they nor we, as to the pra-
 "ctise of our waies, were in England.
 For them indeed, the practise of their
 wayes of separation, were not in
 England; but our way of *parochiall*
Congregations, and the *substantialls*
 of our *Worship*, in the Word *prea-*
shed, whereby they were *regenera-*
 ted;

ted; and the Sacraments *administred*, whereby they were *nourished*; were then in *England* as much as now: Yet from these they *separate*, and deny *communion* with us. For the *success* of their *Ministry*, as *Independents*, I see little fruit of it, but *schism* and separation; nor can they look for any, as *Ministers*; all their *gathered members*, being before converted, (as they suppose and desire) by our *Ministry*: See *Anat. of Indep.* p. 25 f.

Pag. 172. "That in England, "under the Prelates, there were true "Churches, and true Ministers, "though in much disorder, as to the "way of entering into the Ministry, and "dispensing of Ordinances, I freely "grant. Which were they? That he tells us, pag. 173. "Here I let him "know, that I assent unto that summe "of all that he hath to say; namely, "(which were my words) that the "true and faithfull Ministers, with "the people in their severall Congre- "gations, administering the true Ordi- "nances of Jesus Christ, whereof Bap-

Independency further proved,

"ism is one, was, and is, the true Pa
 "Church-state of England, from cum
 "which I am not separated. Who tha
 would not think, the reverend Do- of t
 ctor were a Convert, from the way or o
 of *Independency*, acknowledging all to
 this, and denying separation? Will me
 all *Independents* yield thus much? in
 Can many of them say, They are not di
 separated? What reserve the reverend c
 Doctor hath, that he is not yet wit
 tred a member into one of their mi
 Churches, or that he hath not totally ha
 renounced his *Ordination*, (and that on
 but for some *disorder* onely, or some pr
 addition of human *prudence*, in his titi
 entrance into the *Ministry*) or lastly, ve
 that he sees some *weaknesse*, if not th
 falsnesse, in his principles; "That suc- g
 cessive *Ordination* from Rome, as d
 "a Church, is *Antichristian*, as from h
 "the *Beast*, I cannot tell, nor wiser n
 men then I; but sure we are, g
 that most *Independents* are of another
 mind, and will not thank him for
 these *concessions*, being not able to
 justify their *separation* from our
 Churches, if all the reverend Doctor
 hath said, be true.

Pag. 147. Yet he saies, "It is incumbent on this Author, to prove, that we have been members of some of those particular Churches, in due order, according to the mind of Christ, to all intents and purposes of Church-membership; and that we have in our individuall persons, raised causelesse differences, in those particular Churches, and so separated from them, with the condemnation of them. I promise you, this will be an hard labour, having so many things to prove at once, of the same men; when if I prove not some one particular, he will still deny the whole. But since the reverend Doctor puts himself amongst them, I doubt not, but to make all good upon his party, (they made the division into parties) if not upon himself. First, upon his acknowledgment afore, that our particular Congregations, were, and are, true Churches, it is evident, that they have been members (yea, some of them Ministers) of our particular Churches, or of none. 2. For the due order of being made so, I hope, some little disorder in

in the *institutions* of Christ, does not make a *nullity* in them, though he explains not what he means by *disorder*. 3. According to the mind of Christ. As for *substantialls*, we can affirm it, if not in *circumstantialls*, wherein scarce any Church on earth will be found faultlesse. 4. "To all intents and purposes of Church-membership. Surely our Christianity, and covenant in *Baptism*, bound us to all the duties of Church-membership, though we may fail, as to performance of them. 5. "That, in their individual persons, they have many of them, actually, or really, by separation, raised differences in our Churches, whereof they were members; is too evident to be denied, by conscientious men. 6. That they (many of them, whatever the reverend Doctor hath done) have separated from us; renounced communion with us; is as clearly evident. 7. "And that with condemnation of our Churches, as Antichristian, &c. is also too notorious to be denied. And then the conclusion followes.

Pag. 176. I said, the reverend Do-
 ctor, by his *indulgence* of liberty to all
 men, to follow their own *light*, in
 submitting to any way of Religion,
 seemed to me to be a *Sceptick*, in his
 way of *Independency*. He asks; "*Why*
so? this will gratifie all Sects, Qua-
kers and all, with a toleration: How,
I pray? It is schism, not toleration, we
are treating about. Where the re-
 verend Doctor confounds what I dis-
 tinguish'd: He first seems to be a *Scep-*
tick, (which I prove by that which
 he followes, Does he believe his own
 way to be the onely true way of
 Christ, and yet tolerate other waies?)
 or he seems to gratifie all Sects, *Qua-*
kers, &c. with a toleration, and
 leaves them to judge, what is, or is
 not, according to the *mind* of Christ,
 &c. To which he saies, "*Pray, Sir,*
who is appointed to judge finally for
them? why then should they be denyed
their liberty? May he not say as
 much for *Popery, Anabaptism*, or any
 Sect, and so grant an *universall* tole-
 ration, (which he seems to do, in his
 Epistle to his Sermon, before the last
 Session

Session of Parliament; Who is pointed to judge finally for them why then should they be denied their *liberty*?) He must remember we are not speaking of *circumstances*, about the worship of God wherein severall *Churches* may differ without *schism*; but of the *substantials* of Doctrine, Worship, and Discipline, prescribed by Christ in the Gospel, which are of *necessary observation*, for all Christians. And Christ hath limited all to one *Truth*, one way of *Worship*, one *Discipline* (as we both suppose he hath) certainly every man is bound to get in to that way of Christ, and not left to his *own light*, to judge finally for himself, or to *chuse* or *refuse* a way of Christ, by his own liberty; and may be compelled to the external profession of *Christs way*, in all those particulars, which utterly destroyes his *toleration*. What answers he to my question? Thus: "How if I should say, that our way, and their way, for the substance of them, is one way? But so he might have said of their way,

way, and the *Episcopall* way, for the
Substantials of Religion, they were
 one way; and yet I suppose, he will
 not grant the *members* of his Church,
liberty, to judge of, and to *chuse* the
Episcopall way; or if our way and
 theirs be neerer one another, he will
 hardly grant them *liberty*, to come in-
 to our way, because he judges "their
 "way, to be according to the mind of
 "Christ, and not ours; pag. 178. And
 this, he saies, he is ready personally to
 maintain to me. But why doth he not
 publicly discover and maintain this,
 to all the Churches of the Nation,
 before he set upon the practice of it?
 and puts us off with *delays* and *de-*
signes in hand; which when we shall
 see, we know not. That he hath run
 from severall waies, is not to be
 gain-said, from *Episcopall* to *Presby-*
terian, from that, to *Independentism*,
 &c. is no calumny, though it may be
 to his reproach, which I cannot help.
 If his way be the onely way of Christ,
 I asked, if every man be not bound
 to come unto it, and not upon any
 conceived new light to relinquish it?
 He answers; "Truly I think M. C.
 "him-

They (of N. Eng.)

answered, They could not grant

any form of Govern-ment, but one, seeing there is but one way

laid down in the Word, and that un-changeable.

Answ. to 32. Quest.

Independency further proved,

"himself is bound to come into it
 " (surely not till he give me better
 " light, that it is the way of Christ
 " yet I do not think, that his not-fo-
 " ing makes him a schismatick. But
 if I were convinced, that it was the
 only way of Christ, I should think
 my self schismaticall, in not submit-
 ting to it; as I do him, for renouncing
 the Presbyterian way, which once he
 was convinced of, to be the way of
 Christ. However, it concerns him
 most, in the alteration of his judg-
 ment and practise, to demonstrate
 clearly, his is the way of Christ, and
 not ours, or else we shall judge him
 schismaticall in that separation. This
 he promises again and again, pag. 163
 and 181. in his conclusion of all: In
 expectation and earnest desire where-
 of, I rest.



FINIS.

etter
rift
o-d
Bo
the
thin
omin
ncin
ce h
ay o
him
judg
trace
and
him
This
163.
: In
nere-